DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 329 990 CS 212 741

AUTHOR	Singer, Armand E., Ed.
TITLE	Philological Papers: Special Issue Devoted to the Teacher in Nineteenth- and Twentieth-Century Literature and Film. Volume 36. Papers Presented at the West Virginia University's Annual Colloquium (13th, Morgantown, West Virginia, September 29-October 1, 1988).
INSTITUTION	West Virginia Univ., Morgantown. Coll. of Arts and Sciences.
PUB DATE	90
NOTE	96p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Dept. of Foreign Languages, Chitwood Hall, West Virginia University, Morgantown, WV 26506 ($8.50).
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021)
JOURNAL CIT	Philological Papers; v36 1990
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Elementary Secondary Education; Films; *Film Study; German Literature; Higher Education; Literary Criticism; Literature Appreciation; *Nineteenth Century Literature; *Teachers; *Twentieth Century Literature
IDENTIFIERS	*Film History

ABSTRACT

This volume contains papers read at West Virginia University's Colloquium on "The Teacher in Nineteenth- and Twentieth-Century Literature and Film" including the following 12 articles listed with their authors: "A Second Pair of Eyes: The Editor as Teacher" (Hart L. Wegner); "Don Juan Goes to the Movies" (Armand E. Singer); "The Teacher in Jean Paul's 'Schulmeisterlein Wutz' and J. M. R. Lenz's 'Der Hofmeister'" (Beth Fiori); "The Teacher(')s in the Text: Jeremias Gotthelf's 'Schulmeister' (1838) and the Poetics of Pedagogy" (James W. Rankin); "'But I Digress': The Teacher in 'Under Western Eyes' as a Model for Political Engagement" (Deborah Lovely); "Tyranny, Telling, Learning: Teaching the Female Student" (Anne L. Bower); "Professor Immanuel Rath and Fetishes of Power: Sternberg's 'Der blaue Engel'" (Kenith L. Simmons); "'Oh My; I Am the Teacher': Laura Ingalls Wilder and the Prairie School Teacher" (Ann Romines); "Notes on the Dry Eucalyptus: Wallace Stevens's Professional Voices" (James S. Leonard); "The Teacher as Failure--The Text as Teacher: Hermann Broch's 'Die vier Reden des Studienrats Zacharias'" (Calvin N. Jones); "Two Gurus--Vonnegut's Bokonon and Narayan's Raju: Teachers outside the Classroom" (Felicia Campbell); and "Gail Godwin's Paralyzing Plots and the Woman Professor" (Virginia Smith). (SR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

CS

Philological Papers

ED329990

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Volume 36

Special Issue Devoted to the Teacher in Nineteenth- and Twentieth-Century Literature and Film

CS212741

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Armand Singer

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

West Virginia University

WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY

Philological Papers

Volume 36

Special Issue Devoted to the Teacher in Nineteenth- and Twentieth-Century Literature and Film

The Board of Editors:
Marilyn Bendena
Richard B. Eaton, Jr.
John H. Johnston
Kathleen E. McNerney
Mary W. Singer
Harley U. Taylor
Armand E. Singer, *Editor-in-Chief*
Janice S. Spleth, *Assistant Editor*
John Luchok, *University Editor*

Editorial Consultants:
Gail Galloway Adams
Marcia Aldrich
Joseph F. Renahan
Jürgen E. Schlunk

1990

3

The publication of the *Philological Papers* is sponsored by the Department of Foreign Languages in the College of Arts and Sciences, West Virginia University

MEMBER

CELJ

Council of Editors
of Learned Journals

CONTENTS

A Second Pair of Eyes: The Editor as Teacher	Hart L. Wegner	1
Don Juan Goes to the Movies	Armand E. Singer	9
The Teacher in Jean-Paul's *Schulmeisterlein Wutz* and J.M.R. Lenz's *Der Hofmeister*	Beth Fiori	16
The Teacher(')s in the Text: Jeremias Gotthelf's *Schulmeister* (1838) and the Poetics of Pedagogy	James W. Rankin	22
"But I Digress": The Teacher in *Under Western Eyes* as a Model for Political Engagement	Deborah Lovely	30
Tyranny, Telling, Learning: Teaching the Female Student	Anne L. Bower	38
Professor Immanuel Rath and Fetishes of Power: Sternberg's *Der blaue Engel*	Kenith L. Simmons	46
"Oh My; I Am the Teacher": Laura Ingalls Wilder and the Prairie School Teacher	Ann Romines	53
Notes on the Dry Eucalyptus: Wallace Stevens's Professional Voices	James S. Leonard	61
The Teacher as Failure - The Text as Teacher: Hermann Broch's "Die vier Reden des Studienrats Zacharias"	Calvin N. Jones	68
Two Gurus - Vonnegut's Bokonon and Narayan's Raju: Teachers outside the Classroom	Felicia Campbell	77
Gail Godwin's Paralyzing Plots and the Woman Professor	Virginia Smith	82

This present volume 36 consists of a refereed selection from papers read at West Virginia University's Thirteenth Annual Colloquium: "The Teacher in Nineteenth- and Twentieth-Century Literature and Film," held September 29 to October 1, 1988. Beth Fiori's contribution, dealing as it does with late eighteenth-century works, I trust reveals the wisdom of an occasional if minor stretching of predetermined boundaries.

A similar selection from the Fourteenth Colloquium: "The Relationship between Man and the Environment, "October 12-14, 1989, is scheduled to appear in the fall of 1991. The upcoming Fifteenth Colloquium: "Race, Gender, and Marginality in Modern Literature and Film," October 4-6, 1990, has generated such a spate of proposals and acceptances (almost three hundred in all) that our Editorial Board is planning a double-sized issue, and has already engaged the expertise of a guest editorial consultant, Dr. Judith Stitzel, Director of Women's Studies at West Virginia University, to help weigh our decisions for this 1992 volume.

Perhaps a word is needed in defense (?) or at least by way of explanation of the phrase "Man and the Environment," to which some of the participants and members of the audience took exception. At one time, the phrase actually read "man and *his* environment," a wording obviously even less acceptable in the eyes of certain feminist liberals. Alas, since the Colloquium was dedicated to the longtime environmentalist-editor of the *Philological Papers* and since he began his teaching career at Amherst College as a graduate assistant in a multidisciplinary course entitled "Man and His Environment," the title seemed appropriate. It proved to an extent unfortunate. *Altera tempora, alteri mores.* "His" was deleted;"man" remained, but only in its generic sense. As always, be it said, the Colloquium no less than the *Philological Papers* remains gender, race, religion, age, sexual preference, and college affiliation neutral. Which explains, by the way, why our selections are simply listed chronologically, except from time to time for certain papers delivered before the participants as a whole, and even then, only when their subject matter is of a more general nature.

Copies of this issue and recent and even some earlier volumes are still available at $8.00 each postpaid. Address The Editor, *West Virginia University Philological Papers* , Department of Foreign Languages, Chitwood Hall, West Virginia University, Morgantown, WV, 26506. Make checks payable to the West Virginia University Foundation.

Like many another scholary publisher with limited funding, we produce all our copy within the Department. Consequently we owe a very substantial debt to the dependability and skills of our computer-typists. For three years now the operator in front of the high-tech machinery has been "Penny" Thompson. A grateful tip of the editor's cap to this faithful, cheerful, and expert assistant without whose cooperation none of us would be reading the present annual.

Format and abbreviations, except for the omission of referential bibliographies (we use footnotes only, with subsequent citations within parentheses in the text), follow *PMLA*. Kindly ask or write for a brochure detailing *WVUPP* editorial policies. Papers not following our format must be revised or respectfully declined. Starting with volume 37, the final form of accepted papers should be on computer disk (inquire as to which programs are compatible with our equipment), unless prior permission from the editor is granted to turn them in typed.

A.E.S.

A SECOND PAIR OF EYES: THE EDITOR AS TEACHER*

Beginning writers are often naively enthusiastic about editors, expecting another Maxwell Perkins. Like the legendary editor of Fitzgerald, Hemingway, Wolfe, Lardner, and Marquand at Charles Scribner's Sons, an editor is expected to sense the value in an unknown novelist's writing, champion his cause and - as Perkins did for Thomas Wolfe - straighten out apparently hopeless manuscripts. However valuable editors may be, few people are saying good things about them.

In his essay on Maxwell Perkins, Joseph Epstein - himself an editor - saw the role of the editor thus: "Representing the author to the publisher and the publisher to the author, he is the middleman in what is often a struggle between adversaries. That few authors have ever come up to the expectations of their publishers is axiomatic. The editor, as the man in the middle, must lie to each about the good intentions of the other."[1]

After having a manuscript rejected one may feel justified in agreeing with Adlai Stevenson's observation that "an editor is one who separates the wheat from the chaff and prints the chaff." But after my early admiration for Maxwell Perkins I still don't like to see editors and writers as adversaries.

When I decided to write fiction - if one ever makes such a decision consciously - I was determined to write in the language of my new country, depending on the acquisition of a smooth and flexible language. Of course, I was writing scholarly matter as demanded by my profession, but I wanted to write fiction and I began to submit stories to literary journals. Over the years I learned that the publishing of academic articles is a gentle and genteel business when compared to the sending out of fiction across the transom. A decently-written article is either accepted or its writer receives critical reports from the evaluators, which may help the writer to improve his article. The chance for a meaningful communication from a professional journal is quite good.

The situation in fiction is quite different. Even with good work and carefully selected journals to fit the author's style of writing and thematic considerations of the publications, it is possible to submit stories for years without ever receiving as much as a scrawled "sorry" on the rejection slip. It is true that literary journals are usually understaffed and submissions pile up. For example: the *Michigan Quarterly* receives 2,400 manuscripts per year and publishes

* Delivered as a luncheon speech before the assembled Colloquium participants.

[1] Joseph Epstein, *Plausible Prejudices: Essays on American Writing* (New York: Norton, 1985) 283.

eight stories; *Esquire* receives 6,000 stories for twelve printed; *Atlantic Monthly* 12,000 for fourteen printed stories; not to mention *Redbook* - which doesn't quite belong in this company - of 36,000 fiction submissions per year it prints fifty.[2]

These incredible odds are common knowledge among those of us who regularly submit fiction and yet persist in sending stories out, hoping at times merely for a sign of recognition.

Nine years ago I spoke for the first time at the luncheon of the Modern Literature Colloquium of West Virginia University. The man who sat on my right had just begun to edit *MSS* , a literary journal he had published once before as a young man. During the relationship that developed out of this chance meeting with John Gardner I began to understand how much an editor can teach a writer.[3]

When Gardner asked me to submit a story to the new *MSS* , I didn't put much faith in his promise that he would read it with interest - as he had said - assuming such a promise to be formal courtesy among speakers. On the plane home I recalled the old *MSS* (published when Gardner still lived in Chico, California) where Gardner, William H. Gass, John Hawkes, and Joyce Carol Oates had become known and where Howard Nemerov, W. S. Merwin, William Stafford, and W. D. Snodgrass had published their poetry. Besides, John Gardner was the author of *Grendel, Nickel Mountain, The Sunlight Dialogues, October Light* , a book on Chaucer, and the combative *On Moral Fiction.* He was too famous to read the works of lesser writers. But in spite of these considerations I did submit a story to Gardner at SUNY Binghamton and he wrote back. From that moment on I became the student in a master class taught by the editor of a literary journal. What did this editor teach me?

A lesson John Gardner taught us newer writers was that nothing should ever be considered as being finished. A story may need more work even after it has been published in a journal and before it becomes part of a collection in book form.[4]

Raymond Carver - another of John Gardner's "students" - wrote of his teacher's obsession with rewriting: "He believed in revision, endless revision; it was something very close to his heart and something he felt was vital for writers, at whatever stage of their

---

[2] August and September 1985 issues of *Writer's Digest* .

[3] A closer reading of John Gardner's correspondence with the author can be found in "Dear Heart, Dear Heorot: John Gardner as Editor," *Thor's Hammer: Essays on John Gardner* (Conway, AR: U of Central Arkansas P, 1985) 75-88.

[4] "You speak in your letter of minor inconsistencies between 'Cyankali' and 'Stanislava.' Here's what I think. When you bring the stories together in a collection, you can make changes, bringing them all into harmony" (letter of John Gardner to author, 25 March 1982).

development. And he never seemed to lose patience rereading a student story, even though he might have seen it in five previous incarnations."[5]

This tended to spill from the office into his home. Liz Rosenberg, who had been married to Gardner and who assumed the editorship of *MSS* after his death, wrote in her first letter to me after his motorcycle accident of his dedication to manuscripts submitted to his journal: "It may comfort you to know that John spoke about you often and told me in excruciating detail the plot of your story 'Death in a Quiet Town.' When John was enthusiastic about a story, he virtually re-wrote it in telling the plot, and it could take him hours to describe a four-page story. I loved this in him, even when it grew exasperating after the sixth or seventh student story plot."[6]

Without doubt, Gardner's most remarkable trait as editor-teacher was the close reading he gave to the stories of contributors and students alike. Raymond Carver remembered his time in Chico: "During that period he took my stories more seriously, read them closer than I had any right to expect. I was completely unprepared for the kind of criticism I received from him" (*Novelist* xvi).

Any writer who ever despaired about the indifference and insensitivity - imagined or real - of the editors he dealt with, would have been completely unprepared for Gardner's reaction to manuscripts he considered to be worthwhile. When, after our meeting in Morgantown, I sent him my first story , he replied in less than ten days with a two-page letter, single-spaced as all his communications from then on would be. It was a close reading of "The Stoning of Stanislava," showing genuine interst in the story. There were suggestions for improvement, to be sure, and an admonition not to slip into nihilism. Only later did I read his book *On Moral Fiction* where he expressed the same demand most strongly that the writer serve as life-affirming guide. His letter, however, was generally enthusiastic and in his final paragraph he wrote: "I'm hoping that everything I say will sound exactly right to you and you'll send a revised version. I await it eagerly. Meanwhile, it's been good to hear from you and I'm delighted to see that you're writing. The story is wonderfully vivid in many ways, strange and original. I hope it ends up in *MSS*. Yours, John Gardner" (10 Feb. 1980).

After such an encouraging and (I had to admit) flattering letter it was impossible not to rewrite and try for the very best that this editor expected. Five weeks later I returned "Stanislava" and within two months he once more returned the manuscript with another two-page letter, filled with additional questions that had occurred to him during repeated readings. No

---

5 Raymond Carver in his foreword to John Gardner, *On Becoming a Novelist* (New York: Harper & Row, 1983) xiv.

6 Letter to the author, 7 Oct. 1982.

overt flattery this time, but the close reading of one's manuscript by a major writer is flattering enough. After the usual years of neglect "writers are the most hungry for praise," as François Mauriac observed somewhere. Spurred on I rewrote "Stanislava" in one week, but I didn't hear from him until the fall. He replied, apologetic for the four months' delay: "I spent the summer trying to knock out a novel" (20 Sep. 1980). Although it turned out to be a letter of acceptance, he made additional suggestions and ended by saying: "I hope you agree with me that this story has come a long way, has become in fact a fine piece of art. I hope you will write more. Please, feel free to send me anything you do, whether for *MSS* or only for my comments. (I must say, one of the things I hope to do at *MSS* is print a few authors on a regular basis, like the old *Saturday Evening Post* or the present *New Yorker*)."

Again, everything in this letter was designed to encourage me as a writer, to stimulate my desire to write, because I had been assured of having at least *one* sympathetic reader. But my faith in Gardner as my *own* sympathetic reader was severly tested when I sent him "A Death in a Quiet Town," my next story. I did not hear from him for a whole year. When he finally returned my story the accompanying letter was crowded with questions, almost like those of an interrogator attempting to find out the truth from a suspect. "The spare, cinematic style of this story is beautiful," he wrote, "but I wonder if perhaps it isn't *too* spare. I wouldn't ask you to fill it out to the point of making it a Bellow story, but let me ask some questions" (10 Oct. 1981). These questions weren't to be answered in my next letter - that would have been too simple - but they needed to be addressed before the story could be considered as having been told successfully. "Are the people of the village literally or metaphorically ghosts? . . . Is the village really down to just a few people? If so, was the War to blame? and if that's so, weren't the villagers right to be scared of the Germans? On the other hand, if there are a number of villagers, how come they don't get into the story? Are they oddly quiet? Or what?" If the questions were dizzying and dismaying, offering a good excuse to postpone a rethinking and rewriting of the story, there was the typical Gardner ending to this letter, designed to keep me writing: "I'd be eager to see another version."

By then, unfortunately, I had sent the story to the *Kansas Quarterly* after I had faithfully waited for half a year. When I wrote to the editor of the *Kansas Quarterly* that I wanted my story back, he wrote that the story had already been favorably evaluated by one of the editors and it was in the process of being accepted. Nevertheless I asked for the story to be returned. Once more I rewrote it and on November 14 I sent it back to John Gardner. I honestly believed that the story needed to be rewritten again and was now a better story, because I trusted my editor.

Two weeks later Gardner wrote a nine-page letter, pointing out in detail what was wrong with this particular version: "I will go through the story line by line and page by page

trying to explain what went wrong with the revision . . . . The original version was, for me, *too* obscure, the present version is too explicit, therefore limiting, less powerful. One principle of the greatest art is that some of its areas are mysterious. Every principle I annunciate here is brilliantly expressed in your 'Stanislava'" (4 Dec. 1981).

For the first time in our correspondence I saw in this letter how high a price Gardner had to pay for being an editor, for his care and concern for new writers:

> Because of our conversation the only time we ever met - I don't remember where, but I remember the conversation in intimate detail - and because I honestly and deeply feel that you are in potential a very great writer (no bullshit, no flattery), I have taken the liberty of treating your story as a writing exercise given to a teacher. Please, don't be offended that I "correct" you at every point and argue aesthetics as if I thought myself superior. The length of this letter, if you can guess how busy I am (I haven't written a word myself in six months thanks to that busyness), should show you that I'm terribly serious, however offensive my carping may at moments seem.

The fact that Gardner had no time to spare and still wrote a nine-page letter to a writer learning his craft had a curious effect on me. The worth of my writing was established by the sacrifice, which took away from the editor's life, sleep, and worst of all, from his own work. How could the learning writer be less than serious, less demanding, less dedicated to his own resolve to transform a foreign language into his own, to make it do what he wanted it to do, and finally to justify the editor-teacher's investment of his own precious time? Since we both knew of his sacrifice, we completely accepted the roles we were to play. He never once was the famous writer, never used a single line from any of his works to illustrate a point that he wanted to teach; as a matter of fact, he never once mentioned a single title of his published books or of his works in progress. Since he did not offer his own work as a model for me, even the slightest hint of competitiveness was eliminated. As May Sarton noted in her diary: "I shied away from my peers, partly because writing, as a trade, is so competitive, and I am such a bad loser."[7] We both kept all personal concerns out of our correspondence. Only once did I slip when I mentioned the death of the woman who had served as model for Mme. Zielinski, a character in several of my stories. He didn't answer, and I understood "clear as thunder" - as once he had praised one of my lines - real life didn't matter in our relationship.[8] Only later - and seemingly almost against his will - did glimpses of his harried life slip out in his letters. In his last letter to me (written during his editing of *The Best American Short Stories of 1982*) he confessed:

[7] May Sarton, *At Seventy: A Journal* (New York: Norton, 1984) 55.

[8] Gardner letter, 4 Dec. 1981.

> The awful truth is I'm to go to California this spring to do a commencement speech, the first in my life - one I accepted because I was in a hurry, flustered, not thinking clearly. I'd love to see you if there's a way it can be worked out. At the moment I can't find my schedule because I'm buried in 1,000 magazines from 1981 (for the Foley thing) - not an article of furniture in my house stands uncovered: I've been teaching Dante from memory for three weeks - can't find my book. (25 March 1982)

Ideally an editor ought to be an arbiter, an independently functioning keeper of standards, valid not only for his publication but for the profession of literature at large. In this spirit Gardner taught his far-flung master class: we were to be men and women of letters, not part-time writing hobbyists. His education was a perfecting of the skills of seeing, thinking, and writing until he thought me suitable to be in the company of major writers, not only of this century but since literature began. In one of his letters to me he invoked Chaucer, Racine, Joyce, Homer, and Apollonius of Rhodes. He didn't mention these writers merely in a historical sense but as my fellow writers who successfully had solved a problem that was keeping my work from being better. I and his other "students" could be in the company of these literary greats if we listened to him and did as he suggested (25 March 1982).

If this appears megalomaniacal, it certainly was a most selfless strain. The tentative acceptance of one story was couched in these terms: "Needless to say, you can use me for advice and publish it elsewhere if you please - my whole object is to make possible the publication of new and superb writers, and if someone else publishes them after I've helped them along, that means more pages for another new writer in *MSS* and, usually, more money for the writer. Anyway, you can take 'Cyankali' as accepted sooner or later if you like. It's moving and weirdly intelligent, well worth publication somewhere even as it stands" (25 March 1982).

But the fate of "Cyankali" was to be different. I rewrote it, to be sure, as he had urged me to do, but while I waited for his answer John Gardner was killed in a motorcycle accident on the 14th of September 1982. His loss was greater to me than that of any of my teachers and mentors. I had needed his exhortations to work and I had become used to what some writers crave forever and never find: I had found and lost one intelligent, wise, and caring reader. Not caring about the human being that I was, but about the promise that he thought I carried. And that made all of his work worthwhile for him.

Wasn't there danger to your own identity, to your own style, I have been asked. The answer lies in a statement Gardner made in *On Becoming a Novelist* about the strength and independence of the true writer: "The successful one knows what he knows and will not

budge" (44).

Even before Gardner died I realized that it could not always be like this, that he would not always be there for me. When I reread his letters after his death, I began to notice a pattern of remarks and instructions designed to lead me to greater self-reliance, to greater awareness and sharper self-criticism, so that I would function independently when the editor-teacher withdrew.

After his death I thought about the role this editor had played in my life. A writer dreams his own dreams. Where then does an editor's involvement fit in? Is his task like that of Daniel interpreting Nebuchadnezzar's dream? His task seems to me to help the writer understand his own dream, to allow him to recall and transmit his dream more lucidly. But everything the editor does needs to be done without waking the dreamer. It has to remain the writer's dream. It must not become the editor's dream. The function of good fiction was for Gardner "the creation of a vivid and continuous dream" (*Novelist* 84).

Although John Gardner was a most sensitive and effective editor, he warned against trusting editors. "One should fight like the devil the temptation to think well of editors. They are all, without exception - at least some of the time - incompetent or crazy. . . . It is useful . . . always to think of editors as limited people, though if possible one should treat them politely" (*Novelist* 100-01). But he realized that good criticism is hard to find. "The writer is wise to take good advice wherever he can find it: as long as the editor is willing to keep commenting he is of use" (ibid. 104).

John Gardner "kept commenting," illuminating my writing with brilliant critical insights.

When I reread his letters I had to stop at the opening of his first letter to me; it was as if I heard his voice once more, exhorting me to settle down and write:

> I was delighted to hear from you and get your story "The Stoning of Stanislava." I like the story very much, though I have some objections which I'd like to take up with you, to see if they're helpful. Needless to say, if you wish you can stop reading right here; some people don't want editorial types busting in on the process. But since I am one of those writers always in need of a second pair of eyes, I take the chance that you'll want to hear. (10 Feb. 1980)

When I sit at the typewriter or when I square the edges of a finished manuscript I miss

that second pair of eyes looking over my shoulder.

HART L. WEGNER

DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES
UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA, LAS VEGAS

DON JUAN GOES TO THE MOVIES*

At first glance Don Juan's amorous escapades would not seem to belong in a serious conference on the teacher in modern literature and film. However, after some consideration, I trust that the appropriateness will become more apparent. Don Juan is truly a teacher, a dominie in the school of life itself. Thousands of women, if we may credit his own figures, have studied under and learned all too dearly from him. More to the point, where better to view his techniques than to see him at work, as portrayed by the world's most virile and desirable men, the matinée idols of popular film? Movies (I use the word advisedly, in contradistinction to "cinema") thrive on a diet of handsome males in close contact with beautiful, sexy women. Not just in Hollywood, but in Rome, in London, in Madrid, or in any other film capital on our globe. In catering to this hallowed and profitable tradition, with rare exceptions - e.g., some of the Mozart *Don Giovanni* screenings and a certain Ingmar Bergman picture, to a degree - the legendary seducer's filmic exploits have been aimed at popular, mass taste. What Don Juan does best is not art-arty and does not lend itself especially well to "cinema."

The legend of Don Juan has attracted at times some good, and occasionally great directors, but known its finest moments with an impressive list of box-office gold stars. I could enumerate, between 1906 and this present year of our Lord some hundred examples of Don Juan films, most of them embodying his name in the titles, some the classic version of the legend, some original, a few merely paying venal obeissance to the magic sound of the words "Don Juan," a few clearly indebted to both story and hero, but too proud or independent to echo them. I might claim to have missed virtually none of the titular uses of "Don Juan," but could have allowed a goodly number of related plots to slip through my bibliographic net. To remain conservative, then, I will postulate something over a hundred examples of the legend in under eighty-five years found in just one medium, however omnipresent: the silver screen. Here is a selection of the better, or at least more notorious, specimens.

To start ab ovo, I cite a *Don Juan Tenorio* , directed by one Ricardo de Baños, produced in Spain in 1906, fittingly for a country where the legend as we know it probably originated with Tirso de Molina (?)'s *Burlador de Sevilla* (ca. 1618). With equal justice, this picture's plot derives from Zorrilla's 1844 drama of the same name as the film. It seems to be the first motion picture devoted to the legend. Georges Sadoul gives a few details of the plot.[1]

* Somewhat modified from a paper read as a luncheon speech before the assembled Colloquium participants.

[1] *Histoire générale du cinéma* , 5 vols. (Paris: Editions Denoël, 1946-54), as cited in Paul Davay, *Obliques: Littérature-Théâtre* (Nyons) 4 (1974): 20.

If it is remembered that these primitive films were normally but one reel long, with a running time of around fifteen minutes at most, and that Zorrilla's play is lengthy and complicated and that its many scenes are mentioned in Sadoul's book as being depicted in the movie, we may surmise that it was greatly apocopated, probably little more than a summary of the main sections of the plot, which virtually all Spaniards of that time would have already known well, since it was performed in churches all over the Hispanic world each November 2.

Two years later, Pathé *frères* released, June 6, 1908, another *Don Juan* , the plot this time the traditional one, with the hero killed at the tomb of the father of one of his victims, and disappearing in flames. Listed as being 1082 feet long, the film would count as a one-reeler, the reels holding approximately a thousand feet. By 1908, the Pathé Brothers had opened a branch of their Paris studio in Hollywood, where the film may have been produced.[2]

The next year, in Germany, appeared *Don Juan's Wedding* , directed by the famed German pioneer inventor and producer Oskar Messter (1866-1943), with Giampietro in the lead role. It was a farce, relating the seducer's wedding day problems, when three of his former lovers show up to kidnap him. He escapes by pretending to hang himself. Another one-reeler, still available from the Museum of Modern Art in New York.[3]

The following decade witnessed such forgettable attempts as the French *Un Don Juan moderne* (1914) by Lau Lauritzen, better known for burlesque pieces with Doublepatte and Patachon ("patachon" is a driver of an old broken-down car or springless cart, and also, someone leading a roué's life); we may tentatively assume another farce. Russia's Martov the following year produced a *Don Juan ressuscité* (1915), said to have portrayed a perverse, decadent, "deliquescent" (sic - liquid or soft from age?) lover, typical of the dying Russian Empire's art (Davay 20). A Portuguese *Don João* , based on Zorrilla's play, debuted May 23, 1917. Apparently all three, like so many of these early fragile, combustible, cellulose nitrate prints, have perished. Safer, better, cellulose acetate film was not in general professional use until the 1950s.

---

[2] For references and further data on all these versions and the rest of the hundred or more postulated in this paper, except for those otherwise noted, see my bibliographies under the name in question: *The Don Juan Theme, Versions and Criticism: A Bibliography* (Morgantown: WV UP, 1965); and its five supplements in the *WVUPP* 15(1966): 76-88; 17 (1970): 102-78; 20 (1973): 66-106; 22 (1975): 70-140; and 26 Suppl. (1980): 1-112. A few later references remain on cards intended for publication in 1991.

[3] German title *Don Juan heiratet*. M.O.M.A.'s Circulating Film Library, 11 West 53rd St., New York, NY, 10019, lists it under "Early German Films." Oskar Messter, in his *Mein Weg mit dem Film* (Berlin-Schöneberg: Max Hesses Verlag, 1936), speaks at length about his various films but does not mention this one. Whoever the author, the plot is original.

Among powerful depictions of the character, if not the name, Don Juan, I cite *Blind Husbands* (1919), directed and written by Germany's Erich von Stroheim, filmed in Hollywood. Stroheim himself acted the role of the Austrian lieutenant who effortlessly seduces women. He again acted the lead role in its companion piece, *Foolish Wives* (1920), which he also directed and scripted. This time it was a question of a lecherous confidence man in Monte Carlo who debauches a series of vulnerable women until a symbolic vengeance is wreaked upon him by the father of one of his victims (shades of Tirso's *comendador*?).

The nineteen twenties saw a good number of Don Juan pictures, notably an ambitious *Don Juan et Faust* (1922) from Christian Dietrich Grabbe's 1829 tragedy. Marcel L'Herbier (1890-1979), himself a former poet and playwright, directed it, with Jaque Catelain as the rather flaccid hero. Though copies of the film no longer exist, it was reportedly lavish in its sets and beautifuly costumed but overly literary and expressionistic. One critic spoke of its debt to *The Cabinet of Dr. Caligari* (Davay 21).

Interesting are a trio of American films involving dream sequences, surely indebted to the growing popularity of Sigmund Freud. J. G. Blystone directed Tom Mix in *The Lucky Horseshoe* (1925), using the no longer seen technique, once employed by D. W. Griffith and others, of tinting the black-and-white film with various hues appropriate to the action and story at any given moment. Mix at one point - kidnapped, tied up, and rendered unconscious - dreams that he is Don Juan, fighting gallantly for his heroine. In Frank Capra's *Long Pants* (1927), Harry Langdon, that gentle Chaplinesque comedian and clown, daydreams that he is Don Juan. Finally, Berthold Viertel's *Seven Faces* (1929) gives us Paul Muni as Papa Chibou, caretaker of a Parisian waxworks, who dreams that the figures in the museum, one of them Don Juan (a role also taken by Muni), come to life, and he questions them on the nature of love.

Then, of course, there's the famous *Don Juan* with John Barrymore (1926). Alan Crosland directed him, William Axt provided the music, with additional scores, one source notes, by David Mendoza and Major Edward Bowes. This music was important, recorded by the New York Philharmonic, with added, muffled, distant noises of clashing swords and the like, on huge disks, good for over ten minutes each (this, long before LPs), synchronized with the running film - thus providing Warner Brothers the honor of the first feature-length motion picture utilizing sound, involving the new Vitaphone system, even if in this case only for background music. Warner's partially talking film, *The Jazz Singer* with Al Jolson, followed in 1927, and a new era was born. *Don Juan* was a spectacular success, though critics were not unanimous in their praise. Some complained of the direction, some called Barrymore ageing (he was forty-four at the time), but others admired the lavish, realistic sets including an exact replica of Rome's Sant' Angelo prison) and Barrymore's stunts, especially his sword fights.

He is said to have performed them all himself. The ultimate source of the story is credited to Byron's *Don Juan* , film script by Bess Meredyth.

The long-popular stage versions of Zorrilla, Molière, Mozart, and G. B. Shaw's *Man and Superman* (1901-03) could be expected to serve as frequent sources for film, and they did. Zorrilla's Spanish version of 1906 and the 1917 Portuguese borrowing have already been mentioned. René Cardona's Mexican screening was playing in New York, December 1937, and a TV adaptation was being shown in Spain in November of 1966 with Conchita Velasco as Doña Inés. Not to be outdone, *Don Juan Tenorio 1970,* a short film produced by the University of Wisconsin Department of Spanish and Portuguese, offered excerpts from Zorrilla acted by their own students.

Molière has been equally popular and even better served. The marvelous French comic Fernandel played the Don's servant Sganarelle in an adaptation, entitled *Pantaloons* here in the United States (in France it retained Molière's title *Dom Juan*), by John Berry, Juan Bardem, and Maurice Clavel. Berry directed it. It premiered in New York, on Christmas Day, 1956. In turn this version was reworked for French television in 1965 by Marcel Bluwal, with Michel Piccoli as Don Juan and Claude Brasseur as his servant. A Spanish production of the Molière play, titled *Don Juan* , produced by Carmen Silva, has been around in the 1980s.

Mozart has perhaps fared best, with the one caveat that great voices do not necessarily a great film make. *Don Giovanni* , with outstanding casts, has been filmed more than once almost directly from stage performances: with Cesare Siepi as the Don, Wilhelm Furtwängler conducting, in Salzburg, 1955; a television version under the NBC Opera Company, again with Siepi, April 1960, Englished by no less a poet than Wystan Hugh Auden, in collaboration with Chester Kallman; an abbreviated version, using Vienna Opera stars, 1955-56, conducted by Baumgartner and the Vienna Symphony, Cesare Danova as Don Juan. A twelve-minute, sixteen-mm movie called *Don Juan* was filmed in Poland, 1964, which (says the Library of Congress) "uses animation set to the music of . . . *Don Giovanni* , Latin serenades, and Western ballads, in presenting a surrealistic spoof of the legend of the irresistible male." Peter Shaffer's 1979 play *Amadeus* , about Mozart and Salieri, brings in *Don Giovanni* ; Milos Forman of Czechoslovakia made a notable motion picture out of it in 1984, including a parody of *Don Giovanni* with a dove flying out of a horse's behind. Finest of all, though not universally praised, is the *Don Giovanni* directed by Joseph Losey in collaboration with Frantz Salieri (an eerie coincidence of name), screenplay by the former and others, conducted by Lorin Maazel, and premiered at Washington, DC's Kennedy Center, November 4, 1979. Ruggero Raimondi sang the role of Don Giovanni, Kiri Te Kanawa was Donna Elvira, and Edda Moser Donna Anna. It utilized superb natural Italian settings, but problems arose from the outdoor sound.

Shaw has benefitted from interest stirred by frequent stage revivals of his *Man and Superman* . The National Telefilm Associates (N.T.A.) did a creditable adaptation of the play-within-a-play central section, *Don Juan in Hell* , in 1960,directed by John Desmond and produced by David Susskind. Hurd Hatfield played Don Juan, George C. Scott the Devil, and Siobhan McKenna the very important Donna Ana; another, similar TV production, with the same director and producer, but with a less distinguished cast dates from 1965. Earlier, in 1952, a filming of the well-known stage version of *Don Juan in Hell* with Charles Boyer as the Don, was reported in progress, but it was apparently never released.

(Parenthetically, though we may well dismiss almost all the numerous minor television uses or misuses of the Don Juan legend, let me mention one interesting, ingenious episode of CBS's famous old long-running "Route 66" series, shown November 8, 1963, which has the Central City Colorado Opera Festival putting on Mozart's opera, while offstage a real-life miner-Don Juan is seducing a lonely spinster. They are caught in a mine cave-in. The episode, entitled *The Stone Guest,* was written by the highly regarded Stirling Silliphant.)

Ramón del Valle-Inclán's Marqués de Bradomín, described by his author as a Don Juan "feo, católico y sentimental," hero of the four *Sonatas* , etc., appeared in a 1959 Spanish film of that work directed by Juan Bardem, with Francisco Rabal in the lead role.

Other films worth noting would include *Don Juan's Three Nights* from the Lajos Biró novel, prepared for the screen in 1926 but seemingly never released. Yves Allégret's *La Luxure* (1952) was derived from Barbey d'Aurevilly's *Le Plus bel amour de Don Juan* (Davay 21). Ödön von Horváth's *Don Juan kommt aus dem Krieg* was filmed, or at least projected, around 1970. Chekhov's *Platonov* (untitled in Russian and never properly completed) was given a Soviet production in 1977, with an English title of *An Unfinished Piece for Player Piano* .

Several great directors have essayed Don Juan-like characters. Luis Buñuel's *Cet obscur objet du désir* (1977) would certainly qualify - his "Don Giovanni," one reviewer called it.[4] Director-authors like François Truffaut - consider his screenings of his own series of scenario-novels featuring Antoine Doinel, his Don Juan-like hero: *Les Quatre cents coups* (1959), *Baisers volés* (1968), etc. - and Alain Robbe-Grillet's *L'Homme qui ment* (1969), which incorporates material from the Mozart opera and even parodies the commander's seizing Don Juan by the hand (here a shaking of hands by a Dr. Muller), come to mind. Blake Edwards's *The Man Who Loved Women* , a remake of another Truffaut film, *L'Homme qui aimait les femmes* (1977), appeared in 1983. Federico Fellini's *City of Women* (U. S. 1981) stands as one more example in the career of a director obsessed with sexual encounters and

[4] Vincent Canby, *NY Times* 9 Oct. 1977: 81.

perversions of the human kind. It was a vehicle for the longtime charmer Marcello Mastroianni.

Most original and perhaps the best of the director-auteur versions is, however, Ingmar Bergman's 1960 film *Djävulens Öga* , *The Devil's Eye* (it reached the U. S. in 1961 under this title). The film is a free adaptation of Oluf Bang's Danish radio play (a quite respectable genre in Europe - cf. the fine quality of Günter Eich's many radio scripts). Bergman claims that there is an old Swedish proverb which has it that "a woman's chastity is a sty in the devil's eye." Don Juan (Jarl Kulle) is returned to earth from Hell to remedy that condition in the case of one reluctant virgin. Bergman being Bergman, something of a Don Juan in his own right, the emissary is successful, but in reverse: she remains unseduced, but Don Juan falls in love with *her* , his first real passion. The picture is not usually considered among the director's masterpieces, but it reveals in almost every scene his polished technique.

Whoever the director, the legend has known almost all its popularity as a vehicle for handsome stars. We have already mentioned, among many, Barrymore and Mastroianni. Warren Beatty helped write the screenplay that depicted his amorous successes in 1975's *Shampoo* , a sort of hat trick: Beatty as writer-actor and real-life performer as a latter-day Don Juan. An inversion of the concept of the relentless male seducer explains the box-office success of Brigitte Bardot's *Don Juan 1973 ou Si Don Juan était une femme*. In Roger Vadim's realization, among others Bardot, femme fatale Doña Juana, winds up in bed with Jane Birkin, in addition to, but not simultaneously with, a series of victimized men.

Along with Barrymore, in this country at least, we must showcase Douglas Fairbanks and Errol Flynn. The former can be seen (currently available, by the way, on VCR) in *The Private Life of Don Juan* (1934), a fairly close reproduction of its source, Henri Bataille's French drama, *L'Homme à la rose* (1920). Fairbanks was the heartthrob of his day, and the film has its moments. The best of the dialogue reflects the polish of Gallic boulevardier wit, but depending on which critic one favors, its rating varies considerably. Fairbanks's gymnastic ability and with it some of his charm were on the wane; it is even said that the film's lack of success caused him to retire. Errol Flynn's *Adventures of Don Juan* (1949), on the other hand, did very well. The original scenario had a quite checkered history. The sources are numerous: the Don Juan in question refers to the Mañara version, in which he is saved; his servant is Leporello (from Mozart and the countless heirs of his *Don Giovanni*); Romanticism finds an echo in having the hero fall in love with the unattainable queen of Spain. The rather literary script, in its final avatar, is owed principally to George Oppenheimer, but some ten years before, the distinguished German playwright Carl Zuckmayer, who happened to be in Hollywood at the time, was asked by Warner Brothers to do a story involving Florence and the Medici. Zuckmayer says that he turned the commission down next morning. From 1942 to

1945 William Faulkner, no less, who labored long if not fruitfully in Hollywood's vineyards, worked on the script, disastrously if we are to take Oppenheimer's word for it. The setting wound up in Philip the Third's Spain, not the Medici's Florence. The movie shone, with Flynn adequately dueling and properly dashing, though well liquored up a lot of the time, so gossip had it.

How should this account end? Should we emphasize Don Juan as dominie? Should we allege a certain artistic respectability for these many versions? Can we actually claim a pedagogical goal in the punishment often meted out to our sinner? It is true that the legend has rarely sired any pornography for all the temptations laid in its path, especially on screen. If many of the versions forgive the seducer, few actually laud his activities, and many others punish him severely. One, however, condemns not only his deeds but the whole society that spawned them, and him. With this example we shall close: A short film popular in East Germany and produced there, dating from the 1970s, is a truly anti-Don Juan, cautionary tale. The seducer is arrested after an automobile accident, and the many victims of his lust come to court to testify against him. As they excoriate his sins, he gradually shrinks in size and turns into a little boy. The Communists see in his selfish, childish egocentrism a characteristic of pre-Socialist cultures. May I recall what Dr. Johnson said about a sinner approaching punishment under similar circumstances? "[I]t concentrates his mind wonderfully." As it must for us all!

ARMAND E. SINGER

DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES
WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY
MORGANTOWN

THE TEACHER IN JEAN PAUL'S *SCHULMEISTERLEIN WUTZ* AND J.M.R. LENZ'S *DER HOFMEISTER*

Remarkable literary portrayals of teachers such as Jean Paul's *Schulmeisterlein Wutz* (1793) and J.M.R. Lenz's *Der Hofmeister* (1774) call out to be read as that, as portraits of teachers. However, readers, many of whom are teachers themselves, focus on other elements: the idyllic, humorous, and aesthetic in *Schulmeisterlein Wutz* [1]; and elements of the theater[2] and of social criticism[3] in *Der Hofmeister.* Critics also discuss Jean Paul's theories of education[4] and Lenz's relationship to Rousseau,[5] but different issues arise as I read these works. Why is the main character a teacher and not, for instance, a minister or an artist? What is it about the teacher that fulfills the characters' functions? What characterizes these teachers? How might these portraits contribute to the perception of our profession?

With such questions in mind, I notice three similarities between the two works. They both contain a measure of the idyllic and they both combine comic and tragic, light and dark elements to startling effect. The third similarity is that, although the main characters are teachers, we do not see them teaching, we do not see the scene of instruction. Once we notice this, we must consider why the characters are teachers. I find that the figure of the teacher facilitates other roles, that of the court fool and the eunuch, and that it imparts to the characters a fragility important to the texts.

As we may gather from the precious title, *Leben des vergnügten Schulmeisterlein Maria Wutz in Auenthal,* [6] and from the subtitle, *Eine Art Idylle* , Jean Paul's story

[1] Helmut Küpper, *Jean Pauls* Wuz: *Ein Beitrag zur literarhistorischen Würdigung des Dichters* (Halle [Saale]: Niemeyer, 1928), Ausgewählte Arbeiten aus dem deutschen Seminar zu Halle 22; and Waltraud Wiethölter, *Witzige Illumination: Studien zur Ästhetik Jean Pauls* (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1979) 209-11, Studien zur deutschen Literatur 58.

[2] Ford Briton Parkes, *Epische Elemente in Jakob Michael Reinhold Lenzens Drama* Der Hofmeister (Göppingen: Kümmerle, 1973), Göppinger Arbeiten zur Germanistik 105.

[3] Ottomar Rudolf, *Jakob Michael Reinhold Lenz: Moralist und Aufklärer* (Bad Homburg, v. d. H.: Gehlen, 1970) 158-75; and Inge Stephan and Hans-Gerd Winter, *"Ein vorübergehendes Meteor"? J. M. R. Lenz und seine Rezeption in Deutschland* (Stuttgart: Metzlersche, 1984) 144-65.

[4] Eva J. Engel, ed., *Jean Paul's* Schulmeisterlein Wutz (The Hague: Mouton, 1962) 19-25, 143-53, Anglica Germanica: British Studies in Germanic Languages and Literatures, vol 5.

[5] Norman R. Diffey, *Jakob Michael Reinhold Lenz und Jean-Jacques Rousseau* (Bonn: Bouvier, 1981), Studien zur Germanistik, Anglistik und Komparatistik 104.

[6] Jean Paul (Richter), *Leben des vergnügten Schulmeisterlein Maria Wutz in Auenthal, Werke,* ed. Norbert

describes the small, uneventful, happy life of an odd little village schoolmaster. This story appeared as an appendix to Jean Paul's first novel, *Unsichtbare Loge* . The author calls it an eccentric idyll (Engel 136). Critics commonly attribute the idyllic nature of this story to a vision of his own death Jean Paul experienced the night of November 15, 1790 (Engel 11-13). Faced with his own mortality, he made it his duty to praise the little joys of being alive, to set happiness as the highest aim in life. It is precisely this happiness, the pleasure in the little things of life that strikes us about the life of Schoolmaster Wutz: as a student Wutz was happy all day long, anticipating breakfast, then lunch, then tea, dinner, and finally his warm bed (*Leben* 430-31); as a young man he happily succumbs to the red bonnet ribbons and fluttering red handkerchief of Justel (432-33), whom he courts with gingerbread, when he manages not to eat it all on the way to see her (435-36). As a schoolmaster Wutz does not worry about books he cannot afford; rather, he writes them himself, supplied only with titles from the Leipzig Book Fair. At one point, Wutz simultaneously writes Sturm's *Betrachtungen* , Schiller's *Die Räuber,* and Kant's *Kritik der reinen Vernunft* (425-28). To write his *Messias* , Wutz carefully cuts his pens imperfectly, the better with which to achieve unintelligibility and obscurity (440-41).

But one other thing strikes us about Wutz: his is not merely a contented life. His is a lustful idyll, a life lived with zest and desire, conscious but not forced. Wutz is a man of natural passion, delighting in his environment and in himself. He also delights in others: "Denn einem Schnupftuch in einer weiblichen Hand erlag er stets auf der Stelle ohne weitere Gegenwehr, wie der Löwe dem gedrehten Wagenrade und der Elefant der Maus" (432). The narrator must finally confess the schoolmaster's weakness:

> Überhaupt hab' ich bisher mir unnütze Mühe gegeben, es zu verstecken, daß er in alles sich verliebte, was wie eine Frau aussah; alle Fröhliche seiner Art thun dasselbe; und vielleicht können sie es, weil ihre Liebe sich zwischen den beiden Extremen von Liebe aufhält und beiden abborgt, so wie der Busen Band und Kreole der platonischen und der epikurischen Reize ist. (456)

Wutz is blessed with "ein gewisses wollüstiges trunknes Sehnen" (434).

While *Schulmeisterlein Wutz* is a lustful idyll, *Der Hofmeister* ends up a decidedly lustless one. For the most part, this drama is a far cry from the idyll. Alternately entitled *Vorteile der Privaterziehung* , it relates the story of the private tutor Läuffer, who flees his servile position when it is discovered that he has slept with his student Gustchen, and who castrates himself when he realizes he has fathered her child.[7] Idyllic elements appear in two

Miller (Munich: Hanser, 1960).

[7] Jakob Michael Reinhold Lenz, *Der Hofmeister oder Vorteile der Privaterziehung*, *Werke und Schriften* in 2

limited ways: in the character of the schoolmaster Wenzeslaus, to whom Läuffer flees after the scandal, and in the final sentimental reunion scene. The character of Wenzeslaus and the closing family life tableau parody the idyllic and are distinctive by their peculiar lustlessness. Wenzeslaus is a sensual man who takes pains to channel his desires; he allows himself the pleasures of a meal and a pipe but never a wife. He pontificates in Latin that in love do all errors reside (V. iii, p.81). He praises Läuffer's self-castration as a noble deed that he himself is - almost - ready to imitate (V.iii,p.80). This village schoolmaster enjoys life, but chiefly because he prides himself on mediating his lust. Parkes puts it more strongly: "Er hat sich abgetötet. Das Bild, das man von Wenzeslaus gewinnt, zeigt einen Menschen, der krampfhaft versucht, ein vegetatives Dasein zu führen" (95).

A blissful family portrait closes the drama. Gustchen and her original sweetheart Fritz are reunited; Fritz is reconciled to his father; Fritz's friend Pätus is reconciled to his father, who in turn has found the mother he long ago cast out. Everthing is forgiven, Gustchen's child is embraced, and Fritz declares that his adopted child will never be educated by private tutors. And where is the tutor Läuffer? He has married Lise, a pretty country girl who claims that it is unimportant to her that her groom cannot consummate their marriage and that she indeed prefers to remain childless since she could ill afford to feed children in addition to chickens and ducks (V. x, pp.96-97). Läuffer retires to a bucolic life but never strikes the balance between Platonic and Epicurean love that blesses Schoolmaster Wutz. As a eunuch, Läuffer cannot indulge his sensual appetite, but neither can he limit himself to Platonic love, as we see from his repeated attempts to kiss and embrace Lise (V. x, pp.94-97). Läuffer's lustless idyll is cruelly comic for it is neither lustful nor entirely lustless, and therefore certainly not idyllic.

This brings us to a second point shared by Lenz's *Der Hofmeister* and Jean Paul's *Schulmeisterlein Wutz*. Both works markedly combine comic and tragic, light and dark elements, an effect facilitated by the near caricatures of the main figures. *Der Hofmeister* is entitled *Eine Komödie* , but in letters Lenz also calls it a "Trauerspiel" (qtd. in Yuill xiv). The manuscript of the Berlin production bears the subtitle *Lust- und Trauerspiel* .[8] For Lenz, the main idea of a comedy is the affair, the main idea of a tragedy is the character. In a comedy, the characters are there for the sake of the action, while in a tragedy the action exists for the sake of the character.[9] Lenz calls for German poets to write comically and tragically at the same time to best appeal to their audience.[10] His combination of quasi-tragic fate and comic circumstance or of comic character and potentially tragic situation (Yuill xv) distinguishes *Der Hofmeister* and makes Läuffer's self-castration unforgettable and surprisingly resistant to a

[8] William E. Yuill, foreword to Lenz's *The Tutor*, trans. William E. Yuill (Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1972) xiv-xv.

[9] "Anmerkungen," *Werke und Schriften* I: 359-61.

[10] "Rezension des neuen Minoza ," *Werken und Schriften* I: 419.

straightforward interpretation.

Likewise, Jean Paul's startling juxtaposition of joyful moments and despondent reflections stays in our minds, invites and resists interpretation. Repeatedly we must refocus our gaze as the narrator moves from a delightful description of Wutz's joys to reflections about the transience of life. For example, amid a lush description of Wutz and Justel's wedding we read.

> Bloß die eine Brautführerin (mit einer zu zarten Haut und Seele für ihren schwielenvollen Stand) hört die Freudentrommel wie von einem Echo gedämpft und wie bei einer Königleiche mit Flor bezogen, und die stille Entzückung spannt in Gestalt eines Seufzers die einsame Brust. (453)

Or we read the narrator's words to Wutz, "Schiffe fröhlich über deinen verdünstenden Tropfen Zeit, du kannst es; aber wir könnens nicht alle" (ibid.). After describing Wutz's cozy childhood, the narrator states,

> . . . nachher aber soll ich ordentlich a priori angefangen und mit dem Schulmeisterlein langsam in den drei *aufsteigenden Zeichen* der Alterstufen hinauf und auf der andern Seite in den drei *niedersteigenden* wieder hinab gegangen werden - bis Wutz am Fuß der tiefsten Stufe vor uns ins Grab fällt (425)

Jean Paul's unexpected juxtapositions and Lenz's unsettling combination of comic and tragic, of light and dark elements make these works challenging, teasing, even playful. We are often caught off guard, uncertain how to react. We find ourselves shifting focus, trying to peer more closely at this tutor and at this schoolmaster, only to find our gaze deflected, our vantage point again at a distance. Why are these figures elusive? Why do we feel we do not really know or understand these teachers? Why do they resist close inspection?

One reason is that their teaching remains invisible to us, because the scene of instruction never takes place. Indeed, they are barely teachers to their students. Wutz the schoolboy becomes Wutz the schoolmaster upon his father's death (*Leben* 437), while Läuffer becomes a tutor by default rather than by calling. We are told that Wutz occasionally lectured his father and that he taught the alphabet under his father's supervision in the very week he was learning that most profitless accomplishment, the art of spelling (422). We see the older Wutz leading the choir on the organ and giving a sermon, but never teaching in the classroom. We see Läuffer with his student Gustchen only in her room as they mutually seduce each other with dramatics and examples from literature (Diffey 166-67). We do not see him instructing her

or her brother in the subjects their father had intended: the sciences, civilities, and polite manners (*Hofmeister* I. ii,p.12).

Perhaps we do not see the scene of instruction nor the teaching, because it is not critical that they teach. For the purpose of the literary works, is it critical that these characters are teachers at all? Obviously, Lenz could not rail against the institution of private tutoring were his character not a tutor, and the autobiographical hue of both works would fade were the main characters not teachers. But beyond that, is it important that Läuffer and Wutz are teachers? Yes, but it is not their classroom activity nor their instruction that makes them teachers. Rather, we recognize them as teachers by a constellation of traits. They are odd fellows, *Sonderlinge*, underpaid and underappreciated, each with a distinct posture toward dichotomies traditionally supposed to confront the teacher: the relationship between the life of the mind and that of the body, and the relationship between the classroom and the world. For Wutz there is no dichotomy of mind and body, of classroom and world. He is one with himself and with his environment. With Wutz, life lived is life taught. His position as teacher is also that of learner, and what he teaches is nothing other than the way he learns. Wutz is "der Lehrer als Lernstoff."[11]

The tutor Läuffer also maintains a distinct attitude toward the dichotomies of mind and body, of life taught and life lived. He and Gustchen play out their relationship as if they were literary characters. Gustchen imagines him the Romeo she first fancied her Fritz to be, and then changes her role from Juliet to Heloise when her tutor muses that he might suffer the same fate as Abelard. But at this point Gustchen is already pregnant. Too late do they realize the concrete link between their study and their lives. Läuffer assumes a separation of mind and body so strong that, when confronted with the connection between mind and body, learning and life, the classroom and the bedroom, when confronted with his child, he castrates himself. In the most dramatic way possible, he denies the relationship of mind and body and ends up denying himself both, a eunuch with prospects of becoming neither scholar nor teacher. While Wutz is a wonderful example of the "Lehrer als Lernstoff," Läuffer never integrates himself with the teaching that is life except in a most parodic way.

This invisibility of the scene of instruction makes sense within a typical view of teaching articulated by the character Doktor Windhebel in Kurt Kluge's 1938 novel *Der Herr Kortüm*. Windhebel argues that no one appreciates the importance and influence of the teacher:

> Die andern Berufe bewerten ihre Leistungen am Erzeugnis. Den Lehrer sieht keiner säen, und die Ernte erlebt er selbst nicht mehr. Dem Schulmeister

[11] Karl Lehmann, *Die Gestalt des Lehrers in der deutschen Literatur* (Frankfurt / M: Bollwerk, 1955) 13-14.

würde nur die Zukunft zu danken vermögen, wenn seine größte Leistung nicht ebender unbekannte Schulmeister wäre.

(Cited in Lehmann 12-13).

Hofmeister Läuffer's problem is precisely that everyone does see the seeds he sows, that he comes face to face with the result of his teaching, that he cannot, despite changing his name to Mandel (III. ii,p.52), remain the unknown teacher.

In these two works the character of the teacher is important because it lends itself to other roles: that of the eunuch, because of the teacher's tendency to misapprehend the relationship between the life of the mind and the life of the body, and the role of a whimsical, endearing eccentric, almost that of a fool who, like the court jester, is privileged to speak the truth in mediated fashion. Wutz's fashion of telling a truth is most wonderfully foolish, the most mediated and at the same time the most direct: he simply lives it, collapsing the categories that castrated Läuffer.

Läuffer and Wutz are fragile heroes, one who shockingly demonstrates his own corporal fragility, the other whose story must be told through a fragile network of interwoven details that mimics, even constitutes the texture of his life. They are both fragile figures who elude our direct interpretive gaze, who yield more readily to a touch made gentle by the amusement and puzzlement they elicit.

BETH FIORI

DEPARTMENT OF MODERN LANGUAGES
HOBART AND WILLIAM SMITH COLLEGES
GENEVA, NEW YORK

THE TEACHER (')S IN THE TEXT: JEREMIAS GOTTHELF'S *SCHULMEISTER* (1838) AND THE POETICS OF PEDAGOGY

"Was ist eigentlich nun ein Lehrer anders als ein geistiger Vater seiner Kinder, der ein inneres geistiges Leben zeugen soll in ihnen? Anbrennen und aufflammen lassen soll er in ihnen den göttlichen Funken, daß jede Kraft Flammen sprüht, heiß und weich gezogen werden kann von des Meisters Hand auf rechte Weise. Ein eigenes Licht soll er anzünden in eines jeden Brust, damit es dort nicht dunkel bleibe."[1]

"Was ist eigentlich nun ein Lehrer": In answer to his own rhetorial question - "Just what *is* a teacher?" - Jeremias Gotthelf penned what is surely the most pedagogical novel about pedagogy in nineteenth-century German literature, *Leiden und Freuden eines Schulmeisters*. Considered by no less a critic than Walter Muschg to be "der schönste pädagogische Roman der deutschen Literatur,"[2] the text sets forth the fictional autobiography of Peter Käser, a ne'er-do-well schoolmaster in the rural Emmental of the early 1800s. If in the title we hear echoes of the sufferings of another young man, whose autobiographical memories appeared two generations before those of Peter Käser, Gotthelf's version involves *Stürme* of a very different sort, indeed an unmistakable *Drang* toward pounding a pulpit rather than one's broken heart. Gotthelf made no secret of the novel's didactic nature, as the provocative "Vorwort für laien" reveals:

> Weil dieses Buch von einem Schulmeister handelt, so werden viele es nicht anrühren mögen. Es ist eine alte Mode, daß man die Nase rümpft, wenn man einen Schulmeister von weitem sieht, daß zu gähnen anfängt, wer nur von einem Schulmeister hört. . . . In diesem Buche steht, nun freilich beschrieben, wie der Schulmeister seinen Rock aparti schlengge; aber noch besser ist der Mensch beschrieben, der auch euch im eigenen Herzen sitzt. Schaut euch diesen Menschen recht an; vielleicht macht euch dessen Anblick milder gegen andere, namentlich gegen Schulmeister, strenger aber gegen euch selbst; dann hat dieses Buch auch für euch, Ihr Laien, reichlich Frucht getragen. (II: 9)

[1] Jeremias Gotthelf, *Sämtliche Werke in 24 Bänden*, in Verbindung mit der Familie Bitzius und mit Unterstützung des Kantons Bern, ed. Rudolf Hunziker, Hans Bleosch, Kurt Guggisberg, Werner Juker (Zürich-Erlenbach: Eugen Rentsch Verlag, 1911-77) II:241. All subsequent citations in the text will refer to this edition, using either Roman numerals (for the first 24 volumes, e.g., III: 125) or Arabic (for the Ergänzungsbände, e.g., EB 5: 213).

[2] *Jeremias Gotthelf: Eine Einführung in seine Werke* (München: Lehnen Verlag, 1954) 58.

Thus Gotthelf aims at teaching his narratee - from schoolmaster-to-be to the general public - by way of what Susan Suleiman terms an exemplum, or parabolic, structure,[3] and the narratee immediately knows where the lines are drawn. The novel may be, as Muschg suggests, "halb Tendenzschrift und halb Bekenntnisroman" (66); but many readers would weight the first designation far more heavily than the latter. This of course explains (at least in part) the difficulties Gotthelf's *Schulmeister* has experienced in its reception outside of its original temporal, cultural, and geographic sphere. The gap that emerges between Gotthelf's highly localized narratee - localized not only with respect to a first-hand knowledge of Switzerland and Swiss educational reforms in the 1830s, but also to a submissive stance vis-à-vis the narrator - serves to diffuse the narrator's didactic thrust significantly. The modern reader may construe the text as an informative, at times even quaint, socio-historical document, but will hardly be able to read the novel as Gotthelf no doubt intended it to be read. This discrepancy, coupled with Gotthelf's characteristically complex fusion of *Schriftdeutsch* and *Bärndütsch* , has led to the novel's relative obscurity in the popular market even among Gotthelf's modern devotees.

Yet the *Schulmeister* should be of interest to literary historians and textual critics for a variety of reasons. Certainly the structural analyst should take note of the temporal frame that binds the story at both ends, reminiscent of the temporal manipulations of Jean Paul, whom the young Gotthelf admired (Muschg 67ff). First, we find Peter Käser opening the tale in medias res, narrating his thoughts and actions in the midst of his current predicament as a teacher, and hinting at the circumstances that led him to write down his story. There follows a break in the text, and then we read the autobiography from early childhood up through the present moment of narration, which amounts, of course, to a story about Peter Käser telling his own story.

Interesting as this layering of narrative levels may be, I wish to focus instead on another structural feature of the text, one that bears directly on the topic of teaching and pedagogy: the diversity of narrative didactic voices imbedded within that text. Traditional studies of the novel, notably those of Fehr, Günther, and Muschg, point to the manifold pedagogical influences that aid Peter in his gradual maturity, including his wife Mädeli, the new pastor in Gytiwil, and his friend Wehrdi.[4] Peter, and by analogy the reader, is meant to

[3] See Susan Suleiman, *Authoritarian Fictions: The Ideological Novel as a Literary Genre* (New York: Columbia UP, 1983), in which the exemplum format is discussed throughout. Specifically, Suleiman uses the term to focus on the imitative transaction that an authoritarian author wishes to produce: the reader "sees" the good or bad actions of the fictional characters, and strives to mimic or avoid them, as the case may be. Gotthelf likewise intends to draw on "that mechanism of self-recognition in another, and of repetition/imitation that the roman à thèse solicits from its reader" (250). For further studies of parables/parabolic literary structures, see also Alfred Bourk, "Geste und Parabel," *Akzente* 6 (1959): 214-20; Norbert Miller, "Moderne Parabel?" *Akzente* 6 (1959): 200-13; and Klaus-Peter Philippi, "Parabolisches Erzählen," *DVjs* 43 (1969): 297-332.

learn from all of them. But on another authorial level, beneath these characters as it were, lies a qualitatively different kind of didactic voice. By this I mean the multifaceted presence of the narrators who shape the text and highlight the action and characters traditionally thought to carry the novel's didactic import. I propose that Gotthelf makes use of multiple teachers not only within the confines of the plot, but in its very telling.

Two such voices emerge from the structure of narrative autobiography, fictional or otherwise. We commonly distinguish in such texts between "das erlebende Ich" and "das erzählende Ich," between an experiencing self who moves through time and a narrating self that looks back on that movement. In the *Schulmeister* , this distinction allows Gotthelf to point his warning finger in two directions simultaneously.

First, the experiencing self: Peter Käser, we read, hails from a poor family in a tiny village of the Emmental; a hapless youth, desperate to escape from the poverty, and even more from the emotional abuse of his family. His only respite is the time he spends in school under the care of a compassionate, if wholly incompetent, schoolmaster. Peter succeeds in school - succeeds, that is, as far as the dull-witted schoolmaster can judge his abilities - and at his mentor's suggestion decides to escape from his familial unhappiness by running away to become a schoolmaster himself. His initial success is hampered by a new ruling from Berne which stipulates that all teachers in the canton must pass a competency exam, a plot detail that reveals how closely Gotthelf follows the political developments of his own day (Muschg 59-60). Peter fails miserably, but determines to overcome his incompetency by enrolling in one of the new normal schools instituted by the cantonal government. His first position following certification looks promising, and the new teacher begins with high hopes and an even higher estimation of his own abilities. This optimism is short-lived, however, as he eventually brings ruin upon himself by his immature behavior. Reckless spending, inordinate pride, and an affair with a girl of ill repute combine to drive him out of town in shame. This low point, however, becomes his salvation: forced to seek a second teaching position in the distant village of Gytiwil, he learns humility and listens to those who offer him advice; finds a girl who becomes a faithful wife, companion, and teacher; and progresses, on often rocky paths, to maturity and eventual happiness.

Through the eyes of the experiencing self, the narrator goes to great descriptive lengths to portray the public educational system of the early 1800s in the Emmental, dwelling in extended passages on methods of instruction, the state of the schoolhouses, the status of the

[4] See Karl Fehr, *Das Bild des Menschen bei Jeremias Gotthelf* (Frauenfeld: Huber, 1953) 96-193, for the most extensive but notably uncritical treatment of the novel; Werner Günther, *Jeremias Gotthelf: Wesen und Werk* (Berlin: Erich Schmidt, 1954) 139-43; and especially the brief but very insightful comments by Muschg 58-71.

teacher, even issues surrounding teacher training. Gotthelf's pedagogical aim here is to increase public awareness of the need for drastic reform in the existing system. The narrator lashes out, sometimes with humor and sarcasm, sometimes with direct authorial barbs, but always with sure aim, at the incompetence of the normal schools, the crippling apathy of the townspeople, and the woeful inadequacy of instruction. No character in the text is more aware of this than the experiencing self - the Peter Käser who moves from town to town, from one decrepit schoolhouse to another, and who must bear directly the brunt of the system's shortcomings. The insights gained through this narrative voice prompt critics such as Godwin-Jones to state that "Gotthelf's principal objective in writing the *Schulmeister* [is] to acquaint the reader with the plight of teachers,"[5] and Günther to consider the novel "sozialpädagogisch ein Dokument aus der Schulnot der Zeit" (139). Gotthelf, himself a teacher, a trainer of teachers in Burgdorf, and for ten years the *Schulkommisär* in Lützelflüh, no doubt had this end in mind.

But as the brief plot synopsis above suggests, the blame for this *Schulnot* rests not only on the functional inadequacies of the system, but (in Gotthelf's view) even more on the moral inadequacies of the individual teacher. As Peter Käser records his story, it is the older and wiser narrating self that provides censure for the shortcomings of the experiencing self, most obviously by way of the normative authorial commentary interspersed throughout, but perhaps more poignantly through the constantly reiterated distance between the experiencing and the narrating selves. The reader can detect this difference on the basis of their respective insights: the one is still caught in the web of pride and illusion, the other sees clearly the mistakes from the vantage point of time and maturity. The former tells us, for example:

> Aber, dachte ich mir zum Troste, sie werden es noch erfahren, wen sie an dir gehabt haben; so einen wie du bekommen sie keinen mehr. . . . Es nahm mich nur wunder nach allem Ruhm, den ich erhalten hatte, wie sie es machen können ohne mich. (II: 123)

But the commentary provided by the narrating self views precisely this sort of pride from a wholly different perspective:

> Merkwürdig ist's, daß der Satan nie besser Gelegenheit findet, in uns zu fahren, seine Türe nie weiter offen findet, als wenn wir gerühmt werden. (II: 177)

The narrating self comments throughout on the circumstances of the experiencing self with

[5] Robert Godwin-Jones, *Narrative Strategies in the Novels of Jeremias Gotthelf* (New York-Bern-Frankfurt/M.: Peter Lang, 1986), American Univ. Studies, Series I, Germanic Languages and Literature 42:31.

normative gestures, seeing what the experiencing self could not see: "Von der Höhe, auf die ich mich künstlich hinaufgeschraubt und die ich selbst mir unmerklich untergraben hatte, war ich nun hinuntergestürzt in bodenlose Tiefe" (II: 262). And again: [Die kritik des Pfarrers] machte mich nun fuchswild, ich war durchaus blind über den Zustand, in dem ich war, blind über meine Fehler" (II: 249). Thus what appears on one level to be a critique of the system and its propagators becomes on another a self-revelatory confession of personal failure, repentance, and redemption. Peter Käser, the struggling teacher, reveals himself to be Peter Käser, the struggling sinner. And the narrating self is, in a word, the teacher who holds up this sinner, the experiencing self, as an exemplum in order to draw the didactically correct lesson from the latter's shortcomings.

This problematizes, of course, the whole question of school reform, and Gotthelf no doubt intended his novel to do just that. A constant critic of quick fixes on the part of the Bernese government, Gotthelf refused to accept a prescription for educational reform that did not address what he saw as the primary ailment, namely, the insidious effects of humanity's fallenness. Were Gotthelf to have taken this matter less seriously, the novel could have been written as a strict exemplum - with Peter Käser bumbling through his lessons, the townspeople spreading vicious rumors, and the children wreaking havoc in the schoolhouse - with little or no normative commentary. The tale itself, narrated from the perspective of the naïve experiencing self, would have provided a suitably didactic thrust and the reader could have easily taken the implicit message to heart. Yet Gotthelf was not content merely to depict the problem; he felt constrained to distance himself (and thus the reader) from the young teacher's folly by allowing the maturity of the narrating self to stand as a foil to the error of the experiencing self and verbalize this moral distance.

Viewed with an eye to reader-response criticism, this pervasive use of normative commentary - the signature of the narrating self - threatens to undo the text as a didactic enterprise. As Martinez-Bonati points out, "only the narrator's mimetic sentences are accepted unquestionably. By contrast, his other affirmations, his non-narrative-descriptive ones (generalizations, opinions, moral views . . .) receive . . . only a qualified acceptance or a restrained acknowledgement."[6] Thus when Gotthelf tells the reader, or better, shows the reader the immaturity of the young Peter Käser, we believe that he did what the narrator says he did - within the fictional world. The reader may smile at his antics, find them amusing, or be appalled at Peter's immaturity and pretention. That is to say: the reader's response to this depicted (and accepted) fictional world is left up to the reader without further ado. But when Gotthelf (by way of the narrating self) steps in and tries to "fix" the meaning of his parable, to use Susan Suleiman's term,[7] to draw "correct" conclusions from the fictional world and

[6] Felix Martinez-Bonati, *Fictive Discourse and the Structures of Literature* , trans. Philip W. Silver (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1981) 32.

[7] See Suleiman 71 and 243, regarding "fixing" the meaning of a text for the sake of didactic unambiguity.

apply them to the real world of the reader, the reader is no longer constrained to accept this narrator's judgment. Thus when the narrating self tells us, as he does a hundred times in so many words, "This was a foolish thing for me to do, and likewise for anyone else . . .," the reader does not respond to this statement with the same "subtle form of fundamental credence" that Martinez-Bonati ascribes to readers of mimetic, depictive statements (31). The reader may agree, or disagree, or leave the statement with no conviction; but Gotthelf cannot elicit the same sort of compulsory acceptance of such sentiments that depictions alone allow. As a result, Gotthelf is forced to manipulate the text to make the narrating self as credible as possible. He allows him to evince maturity and wisdom in all his utterances, portrays him (now in middle age) as a faithful father and husband, and stimulates the reader's pity for his present financial plight. Whether Gotthelf succeeds in evoking the reader's trust is another matter altogether, but the attempt to do so remains a hallmark of the novel's structure.

In this manipulation of character, this pervasive give-and-take, this splitting of the text into depiction and discourse, into multiple narrative levels that coerce the reader into drawing the "right" conclusions, we see the third teacher at work: Gotthelf the craftsman of a singularly didactic text. The first teacher tells the reader, by way of an extended exemplum, how one should and should not run a school in the context of a less-than-helpful community; the second tells us, by more normative gestures, how one's pride and folly can lead to disaster in the context of imperfect human nature; but this third teacher suggests how an author should shape a text to prove a point, or carry a lesson to the reader. For while the latent content of the various textual narrative levels in *Schulmeister* point assuredly to questions of moral pedagogy, the very diversity of these levels points as well to the inherent problems of textual pedagogy.

At the novel's outset, we see Gotthelf's manipulation of the overall structure in the framing technique - a ploy he utilized in almost every one of his early texts, with varying degrees of finesse. A *Manuskriptfiktion* similar to that seen in *Schulmeister* is tacked on, rather clumsily, to the end of his first novel, *Bauernspiegel* . Each of the early novellas - "Wie fünf Mädchen im Branntwein jämmerlich umkommen," "Dursli der Branntweinsäufer," and "Der Ritter von Brandis" - makes use of the frame structure, as of course does Gotthelf's best-known novella, "Die schwarze Spinne." But to what didactic advantage? In every case, the inclusion of a narrative frame allows the reader to form an initial opinion of the narrator who eventually goes on the tell the inner story; and in every case, the narrator portrayed in the frame emerges as reliable, full of experience and wisdom, trustworthy, and thus a guide whose comments on the story, as well as the story itself, are to be taken at face value.

Equally characteristic of Gotthelf's early tales is the splitting of his text into depictive and discursive levels, as discussed above with regard to the narrating self. Gotthelf presents

us with a scene, brimming with rich descriptions of landscape and action, and pulsing with realistic dialogue. Then he turns our attention away from the fictional world and issues a warning, a sermon, even a tirade intended to apply to the "real"world. Then back he shifts to the fictional for another scene, back to the discursive level of normative commentary, and so on for the duration of the text. Gotthelf himself was apologetically aware of this continual *hin und her* , and admitted once in a letter:

> Daß der Reflexion zuviel ist, weiß ich wohl; es geschah in einer Art Verzweiflung. Der Stoff überwältigte mich. Das Beste konnte ich nicht geben, konnte nicht dazu gelangen. Das Dramatische schien mir zu unbedeutend, und um zu salzen und zu spicken reflecktierte ich, damit die Leute doch was hätten. (EB 5: 278)

Yet despite his apology here, it remains part and parcel of his didactic approach throughout his writing. In this strategy, as nowhere else, the text reveals the teacher at work. Ironically, it is when Gotthelf becomes thoroughly engrossed in the depiction alone - in "Das Dramatische," as he terms it - and neglects to include his authorial reflections that the text seems to gain, rather than lose, in didactic significance.

So vehement do these reflections become that at times, at least in *Schulmeister* , the reader can distinguish not only between the experiencing and the narrating self, but also between the narrating self and Gotthelf the author. Gotthelf in such instances becomes not only the teacher who shapes the text to include multiple levels of insight, but a third didactic voice within the text itself. The experiencing self in *Schulmeister* may elicit our pity, if not our recognition of wrong doing; the narrating self, with his repeated normative gestures, we may forgive, for he is after all a schoolmaster; but the author's direct intrusions as such are a wholly unwelcome distraction. Notice how these various teachers affect the text of a single passage with their respective didactic emphases. First, the experiencing self: "So ein Pfarrer habe gut balgen, dachte ich, aber was ein Schulmeister neben der Schule mache, gehe ihn nichts an" (II: 280-81). Then, the narrating self at a morally acceptable distance: "Ich fühlte, daß mir unrecht getan worden, hatte aber nicht Verstand genug, einzusehen, wie eigentlich die Sache stehe, und meinte, mein Tun und Lassen hätte der Pfarrer viel zu strenge gerichtet" (II: 280). Finally, Gotthelf himself, trying to convey his intended message, but intruding so clumsily into the text that the fiction of Peter Käser, either as experiencing or narrating self, is trampled beyond recognition: "Wie doch so ein junger Mensch und noch dazu ein junger Schulmeister nie gefehlt haben will, wie er so verblendet sein kann, sein ganzes Tun und Lassen, seine ganze Lage zu mißkennen!" (II: 281). If such passages are meant to teach the narratee, they do so only at the expense of fairly insulting the narratee's own moral

discernment. That is to say: such explicit explanations and exhortations imply that the narratee is incapable of seeing the point unaided.

To reiterate Gotthelf's own question: "Was ist nun eigentlich ein Lehrer anders als ein geistiger Vater seiner Kinder?" What else indeed? Gotthelf's text reveals a startling multiplicity of answers to this seemingly rhetorical question, answers that unveil the problems inherent not only in teaching, but in teaching through a text. Like any good teacher, Gotthelf (no doubt unwittingly) raises more questions in this regard than he answers.

JAMES W. RANKIN

GERMAN DEPARTMENT
SUNY AT BINGHAMTON

"BUT I DIGRESS": THE TEACHER IN *UNDER WESTERN EYES* AS A MODEL FOR POLITICAL ENGAGEMENT

In 1986, Thomas J. Cousineau concentrated on the political and psychological ambiguities in Razumov's confessions as to betraying a Russian political assassin and noted that the narrator of *Under Western Eyes* , "the teacher of many languages,"

> allows himself to be distracted by such essentially static and irrelevant considerations as the supposed differences between Russia and the West. Furthermore, he deprives these ruminations of the positive value which they might potentially contain by interpreting cultural differences as signs of differing states of mind rather than by relating them to actually existing material realities.[1]

Cousineau follows in a long line of critics out to divorce the psychological from the political in Conrad's works, an effort I believe not only difficult, as Cousineau admits in his own writing, but in this instance wrong-headed, as I will try to establish by showing the teacher as a model for appropriate political engagement.

Before doing so I will have to admit the weight of critical opinion against me. Many critics, such as Howe, Hawthorn, Kirschner, Guérard, Hay, Fleishman, Moore, Cobley, Szittya, Cox, LaBossière, in other words a sort of who's who in Conrad studies,[2] see the

---

[1] "The Ambiguity of Razumov's Confession in *Under Western Eyes* ," *Conradiana* 18.1 (1986): 39.

[2] Tony Tanner judges the narrator "scrupulously fair in his handling of evidence" and thereby supports Conrad's claim of an impartial and disinterested observer ("Nightmare and Complacency: Razumov and the Western Eye," *Crit Q* 4.3 [1962]: 199). Gene Moore, however, lists discrepancies of time and place in the narration to conclude that this teacher-narrator "knows too much but understands too little" ("Chronotopes and Voices in *Under Western Eyes*," *Conradiana* 18.1 [1986]: 23). Jeremy Hawthorn's referring to the "subtle shifts of narrative perspective" that make the teacher become the "Eyes" of the title seems in keeping with Moore's assessment ("Introduction," *Under Western Eyes* [New York: Oxford UP, 1983] 7-8). Paul Kirschner's refinement on Hawthorn's "eyes" has it that these shifts in narrative perspective are more like "spectacles" to be slipped "on or off at will" to split even more emphatically the teacher's observation from his comprehension ("Revolution, Feminism, and Conrad's Western 'I,'" *Conradiana* 17.1 [1985]: 24, n. 25).

Other critics see the teacher as a device to encourage the reader to a different conclusion from the narrator's own. Irving Howe is perhaps most circumspect in this regard, though charging that the "fumbling narrator" signifies Conrad's wish "to disassociate himself from his own imagination" so that while "the narrator expresses Conrad's opinions, the narrative incarnates Conrad's vision" (*Politics and the Novel* [Cleveland, OH:

teacher of many languages at best as a distancing device Conrad felt needed to gain the required impartiality; Conrad himself referred in his preface to the "old teacher" as "useful" and asserted as well that his greatest concern for this novel was to maintain "scrupulous impartiality."[3]

In this same Author's Note (written, incidentally, almost nine years after *Under Western Eyes* was first published), Conrad states his intent was "to render not so much the

---

Meridian Books, 1957] 89). Eloise Knapp Hay too sees a division between narrator and narrative, so that the "dull, elderly" narrator's "misconceptions" and "inadequacy" intensify readers' insights (*The Political Novels of Joseph Conrad: A Critical Study* [Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1963] 296-98). In those pages Hay also supports Albert Guérard's view that the narrator's "astonishment at the revolutionaries' visiting Razumov after his confession . . . throws an unfavorable light on his own automatic moralism"; see his *Conrad the Novelist* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1958) 245. Adam Grillon also views the "elderly teacher as an unreliable narrator" forcing the reader to take sides (*Joseph Conrad* [Boston: Twayne, 1982] 130).

Some critics, of course, see the teacher-narrator strictly according to his own description. Evelyn Cobley is perhaps the most generous in assenting to the narrator's view of himself, so that he becomes for her "a passive and mediocre person" as well as a "tolerant spectator" ("Political Ambiguities in *Under Western Eyes* and *Doktor Faustus*," *CRCL* 10.3 [1983]: 383). C.B. Cox finds the teacher-narrator "a most unsatisfactory device" because he is both an "uncomprehending bystander and imaginative narrator" (*Joseph Conrad: The Modern Imagination* [London: Dent, 1974] 102-17). Penn R. Szittya similarly considers the narrator one who attempts to divorce himself from any involvement in the story and to see himself as "the complacent if slightly puzzled conduit through which the story passes unchanged" ("Metafiction: The Double Narration in *Under Western Eyes*," *ELH* 48.4 [1981]: 837). Camille R. La Bossière is perhaps the most damning in finding the teacher together with Nathalie encouraging Mrs. Haldin toward the "lie" that actually reflects the truth of her son's being betrayed. La Bossière believes the teacher thereby joins "the cast of comic characters in a tragic joke" ("'A Matter of Feeling': A Note on Conrad's Comedy of Errors in *Under Western Eyes*," *Thalia* 2.1-2 [1979]: 37).

For my purposes, Avrom Fleishman and Cousineau have best defined the critical problem of the teacher-narrator's relation to appropriate political engagement. Fleishman's assessment of *UWE* as Conrad's affirmation of a political community that is a "living culture inviting personal identification" rather than a "set of artificial relations among discrete individuals" (233) is very close to my own view of the novel, but Fleishman nevertheless views the teacher as having a "dampening effect" on the evident and appropriate passion of the novel (217) and finally assigns the teacher the role of the skeptic to oppose the idealistic Nathalie, so that the ensuing dialectic results in a vision of an "organic community" (238-40); see his *Conrad's Politics: Community and Anarchy in the Fiction of Joseph Conrad* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins P, 1967). Cousineau finds *UWE*'s political view ambiguous in its predictions, if not its indictments, and the teacher-narrator one "whose skepticism is paid for by his inability to respond to legitimate revolutionary aspirations" (39).

[3] *Under Western Eyes* (New York: Penguin Classics, 1985) 50. All page references are to this edition.

political state as the psychology of Russia itself" (49), but that claim, which seems to reassert the divide between the political and psychological, was at least in part motivated by an attempt to rescue his work from the seeming oblivion to which the 1917 revolution would relegate it. We can now see, however, that this novel need not be tied to exact or immediate particulars of Russian or Swiss political existence to be termed a political novel, any more than Costaguana need exist or the attempt on Greenwich come from a retarded boy. What is political in *Under Western Eyes* is the combined effects of people and institutions on individual existence, what Said has called the "mechanisms of existence," in a phrase from his book on Conrad, taken to mean not Cousineau's "material realities" but how a person goes about finding and securing a developing existence trying for social justice, individual thought, and perhaps happiness. I take this phrase from Said, who took it in turn from Richard Curle, because it emphasizes the interrelation rather than the separation of people and institutions, as is evident in "material realities" distinct from "states of mind."[4] As a justification for my emphasis I give the novel's heroine, Nathalie Haldin, whose contribution to the work in which her brother was involved through political assassination is to labor in "the horrors of overcrowded jails, and the heartrending misery of bereaved homes" (346), actions split between Russian institutional life and private grief. That her decision is to emphasize both suggests the interrelation between rather than the separation of these public and private spheres. In sum, no act is without both public and private consequences, and no private feeling is wholly separate from public pressures. In *Under Western Eyes* everything is political.

A passage excised from Conrad's manuscript shows such concerns with these "mechanisms of existence," and that it is excised reveals much of Conrad's intent for this novel. In the passage, the teacher compares Nathalie to his niece, who is about to marry a journalist in Canada. That marriage

> would not interfere with their individual usefulness to the community; each would preserve an intact personality. . . . While writing my congratulations I felt strangely out of it somehow - an outsider in this relation too, to the point of asking myself why these two were marrying . . . - how could they ever have allowed such an interference with their precious personalities as falling in love with each other necessarily amounted to.
>
> "We have cheerfully agreed to differ on certain points," my niece announced. Well, of course, if their happiness were a matter of formal agreement.[5]

[4] Though Said did not examine *UWE* , his explanations of this phrase taken from Curle's assessment of the character and quality of Conrad's daily thought apply nicely to the novel: Edward Said, *Joseph Conrad and the Fiction of Autobiography* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1966) 5; Richard Curle, *The Last Twelve Years of Joseph Conrad* (New York: Russell & Russell, 1968) 23.

The acerbic character of this passage explains much of why it was excised; no impartiality can be effected from "precious personalities" or happiness as a "formal agreement," despite the teacher's feeling an "outsider in this relation too," a feeling that would seem to impart neutrality along with distance, yet so clearly displays irritation and condescension along with hurt. This excised passage does, however, show in heightened and exaggerated form the teacher's relation to Nathalie, its affection and care. Even more tellingly, this passage shows the teacher with a felt divide between public and private spheres, a divide Conrad did not want his teacher to maintain because such a division between public and private leads to corruption in both spheres, as Razumov's story, the protagonist's story, makes clear.

Comparing Conrad's original conception of the story, given in a letter to John Galsworthy in January 1908, with the finished novel also shows Conrad's intention to de-emphasize the strictly private as separate from the public and more immediately obviously political.[6] The idea for the short story was to have the protagonist Razumov (for whom the story was to have been named, a title that in itself would have emphasized the private and personal) marry the sister of the man he betrayed and be driven to confess only after their son continues to resemble the dead brother and thereby remind Razumov of the betrayal. The novel resulting from this germ of an idea is, of course, quite different, especially in that Razumov and Nathalie barely meet one another before Razumov is driven to confess. By abbreviating the time between their meeting and the confession, Conrad de-emphasizes the strictly private as, of course, does Razumov's subsequent confession to the Russian expatriots and revolutionaries. That Razumov is driven to both a private and a public confession shows that both are necessary, a requirement which, until this point, he has never before held.

Consider Razumov's "biography," as it were: born out of wedlock, the illegitimate son of Prince K--- harbors no resentment, bitterness, or envy toward the legitimate members of his family. He has no close friends and seeks no intimates. He has no thoughts of women, until meeting Nathalie and her mother (183), and has never had any experience of "filial relation" (320). Before and even after his betraying Haldin, Razumov dreams only of the public recognition of being a "celebrated old professor" (63). The teacher of many languages avers that Razumov's dreams are not "strange"; "a man's real life is that accorded to him in the thoughts of other men by reason of respect or natural love" (63). Whether the bond springs from intellectual or emotional sources, then, the essential requirement is that it partake of the public *and* the private: "one's real life" comes from other men, yet not from their overt gestures or responses, but rather their "thoughts." That combination of public and private

[5] Kirschner finds this passage "regrettably cancelled" because it serves to underscore that East and West are not antithetical (19). I agree on that point but obviously feel his concern less significant than preventing the ongoing division between the public and private.

[6] G. Jean-Aubry, ed., *Joseph Conrad: Life and Letters* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1927) 64-65.

finally comes to Razumov as he is driven to confess to Nathalie (a confession witnessed, interestingly enough, by the teacher, though neither Razumov nor Nathalie is particularly aware of his presence) and then to repeat the confession to the Russian revolutionaries. His confession to Nathalie is amplified, of course, in his sending his diary to her, and the relation between public and private gains further emphasis in her delivering the diary to the teacher, who makes it available to Sophia Antonovna (347) and then to the reading public, a public which pretty much has to read in private yet imaginatively allow for these others, the characters and public circumstances of the novel. This reconciliation of the public and private gains striking emphasis too from the news at the novel's end that Razumov has gained the revolutionaries' respect for his ideas even after confessing to betraying Haldin.

Combining the public and private reaches a crisis point with Razumov's writing on the tiny island dedicated to Rousseau, an island allowing the privacy required for him to report the goings-on of the Russian revolutionaries living as expatriots in Geneva. He is engaged in a rather despicable reporting on the activities of a, for the most part, despicable group, and he finds this island has "something of naive, odious and inane simplicity" along with "something pretentious and shabby" (279). If these assessments were Razumov's alone, such as his finding the working man's semi-reclining in "lordly repose" disgusting (211), the readily available view would be that these feelings were an attempt to pass along feelings of guilt to other people and places representing public institutions. But when the narrator, ostensibly the teacher, refers to the "exiled effigy of the author of the *Social Contract* . . . enthroned above the bowed head of Razumov" (280), the tension between public and private becomes ludicrous and untenable with the parody of autocratic rule from Razumov's "bowed head" and an "enthroned effigy" nevertheless extending to Razumov the protection needed for him to write to and thereby support an oppressive autocratic regime. The further tension between public and private evident in this passage, in Razumov's phrase now, on this "absurd island" comes from the residents' never visiting this shrine to the thinker who tried to justify legitimate government but instead, as the teacher notes, passing by seemingly "unwilling even to look." The teacher also had earlier noted the blasé and complacent existence of a Swiss couple on a vulgar outing to another park, where,

> the man, colourlessly uncouth, was drinking beer out of a glittering glass; the woman, rustic and placid, leaning back in the rough chair, gazed idly around. (175)

In seeing the Swiss as vulgar and complacent as Razumov does, the teacher identifies and supports some of the same anxieties about or opinions of various political institutions and their effects on people's public and private lives. What is important to recognize, however, is that whichever public institutions or private concerns the teacher denigrates or supports is not so

important as *how* he goes about making his assessments and passing them along.

Most remarkable, I think, is the teacher's never explaining why he is presenting this diary or story. His not explaining supports the long-standing critical opinion that this teacher is something of a dullard, with a role similar to that of the Jamesian "ficelles," purposefully kept from knowing too much so as to engage the readers in discovery.[7] But this critical view disregards another significant feature of this teacher's narrative. "But I digress" or some very similar formulation comes each time the teacher attempts a generalization or explanation for his assumed readers. Though at first glance this phrase "but I digress" can seem a point of characterization, the stereotype of the professor as a wise but slightly befuddled fellow of good will starting to go off-topic and apologetically returning, or a technique to undercut this teacher-narrator's reliability, I think otherwise. "But I digress" becomes a technique to break off any set assessment or explanation to return specifically to the story events to demonstrate that if any new understanding is possible, it can come only through investigating specifics of event and personality rather than from using those specifics to support a preconceived opinion.

For an early example, see the second page of the novel, where the teacher apologizes for his digression on the "Russians' extraordinary love of words." He has broken off from what comes to be a rather typical attempt at generalization, though an unresolved one. The Russians have

> a generosity in their ardour of speech which removes it as far as possible from common loquacity; and it is ever too disconnected to be classed as eloquence . . . . (56)

Neither "loquacity" nor "eloquence," the "generosity " suggests both the sheer numbers of words and a kind of heartfelt, pell-mell rushing toward expressed convictions.[8] Though the teacher has not explained why he would be interested in handing over the diary to us, certainly his wish to report Razumov's history has to partake of this desire to express genuinely felt convictions, yet this teacher-narrator breaks off his generalized assessment about Russians to return to specifics of Razumov and the diary.

This pattern is reestablished after Razumov's crisis from betraying Victor Haldin when the teacher interjects a long pronouncement in which he gives the connection between the particular and the general, or in the words of the novel, a "précis of a strange human

[7] See my note 2, paragraph 2.

[8] Kirschner has found a marvelous report from an Englishman who traveled to Russia in 1904 to 1905, a report available to Conrad through several sources, to support this view of Russians able to express heartfelt convictions and ideas not because of any oratorical training but because of new opportunities to announce and exchange these opinions after centuries of repression (16).

document" and "the rendering . . . of the moral conditions ruling over a large portion of this earth's surface" and describes that connection as "cynicism." This explanation of cynicism he then applies to all Russian political, social, and personal life. He apologizes for the digression but then justifies it by referring to Razumov's shock of contact with Haldin, a shock which forces him to recognize his felt divide between public and private. This feeling of division is, I think, false in the novel's larger scope, but the teacher calls attention to this particular of Razumov's reaction to guide us as readers toward a better, more appropriate, understanding. The particulars to which the teacher turns are that Razumov "woke up for the tenth time perhaps with a heavy shiver" (105). The "perhaps" does not undercut the particulars of numbering "the tenth time" so much as point once again to how particulars can lead to a new understanding, in this case, of Razumov's developing character caught up in necessarily political events despite his wanting to lead only a publicly respected private life.

The teacher's emphasis on details is characteristic not only in his role as narrator but also in his role as character. He insists that Nathalie tell him "all the details" (164) of her visit to the Château Borel, and Nathalie obliges him for some thiry-odd pages. Still the teacher presses for more information; he feels Nathalie "unwilling to enter into the details" of her first meeting with Razumov (185). Even granting this teacher feelings of jealousy and personal blindness to such feelings, the tactic he uses is first to ask her general impression, then press her to expand upon it to supply details he, and presumably his readers, will use to interpret appropriately. In this case of pressing Nathalie, the tactic works.

One interesting exception to the teacher's press for details comes in his description and explanation of the loathsome Madame de S ---. The teacher has described her scandalous and disgusting affairs when he breaks off to announce, "but it's no use going into details" (179). This apparent reversal is motivated by more than a priggish reluctance to engage in the sordid and sensational as the teacher-narrator breaks off once again to give details of his particular knowledge gained not through some kind of artistic or imaginative accomplishment but through his acquaintance with a professorial colleague's Russian wife. Details, for a moment suppressed, are reintroduced to support a generalization the teacher gives about Westerners' not being "attuned to certain tones of cynicism and cruelty, of moral negation and even of moral distress" (180), but this generalization is both introduced as a digression and offered as an excuse to return to specifics of the story proper.

I should note here the novel's conclusion to further support my view of Conrad's presenting this teacher as a model of appropriate political engagement. That the ending is indeterminate - with the teacher's meeting the older woman revolutionary, Sophia Antonovna, who declares Peter Ivanovitch "an inspired man," while this teacher, who has always doubted this "great feminist," vacillates among hostile jabs, cynical remarks, and pointed concerns

about the fellow - seems obvious.[9] However, such indeterminacy is in keeping with this teacher's role of encouraging ongoing investigation and reassessment; the teacher does so by not concluding, though he is willing enough to announce his positions and views.

What I want to stress is that with *Under Western Eyes* Conrad no longer insisted that public and private concerns are divorced, as is so evident in his earlier political novels. *Nostromo* and *Secret Agent* divorced the private from the public, that is, political,sphere, so that in the first, private concerns corrupt the social order, while in the second,political events corrupt private life. In *Under Western Eyes* the private and public concerns intertwine so that neither operates appropriately at the expense of the other.

The teacher, because of his personal concern for Nathalie, becomes involved in Russian social justice. Because he is a teacher (shall I say a good teacher?), he is incapable of imposing his views on others but instead emphasizes the means to come to a new understanding. Those means, promulgated by the teacher, are to reassess any generaliz.ations by referring to particulars. This teacher becomes a model for appropriate political engagement becase he has private concerns, the ability to generalize, and the wish to turn others back to particulars, to details, to reassess those features of political life to be despised, embraced, or tolerated for incorporating the private and public, and combining the psychological with the political.

DEBORAH LOVELY

ENGLISH DEPARTMENT
PENN STATE UNIVERSITY
ALTOONA CAMPUS

[9] Thomas Moser has found some parallels for characterization in *UWE* in the relations of Constance and Olive Garnett and Sergey Stepniak ("An English Context for Conrad's Russian Characters: Sergey Stepniak and the Diary of Olive Garnett," *JML* II.1 [1984]: 3-44).

TYRANNY, TELLING, LEARNING: TEACHING THE FEMALE STUDENT

Literature is replete with depictions of teacher-student relationships. In observing such depictions one can readily note that, in the role of transmitter of culture, a teacher can easily become a dominating and manipulative force. Within this dynamic, and especially when the student is female, the student can become not the recipient of lessons, but an object serving some other need of the teacher. In their desire to teach or transform the female student, such teachers can all too easily destroy her.

In order to investigate the phenomenon of teaching gone askew, and also to look at ways language can be used as an instrument of dominance, I will work with four texts: two plays, a novel, and a film. In these works one female and three male teachers assert their authority over their students in varying ways. Eugene Ionesco's totalitarian Professor, at the end of *The Lesson* , stabs his eighteen-year-old student in an orgiastic display of aggressive rage. Muriel Spark's Jean Brodie (from the novel *The Prime of Miss Jean Brodie*) is an egotistical schoolteacher whose personal influence contributes little of lasting positive value to her pupils and, in fact, pushes one student to sexual experimentation and uneasy religious conversion and another to her death. George Bernard Shaw's Professor Higgins, from the play *Pygmalion,* subjects his student Eliza to intellectual and emotional abuse or simply ignores her. However, Professor Frank Bryant, in the film *Educating Rita* , is a teacher who knows his own faults. He admits his academic staleness and alcoholism, and worries that he will harm his student Rita. He fears that university education will make Rita lose her direct and insightful way of responding to literature and life.

Ionesco's 1950 one-act play, *The Lesson* , is a satiric study in academic and language tyranny. The young woman who comes to the Professor's home for instruction is totally unqualified for the "total doctorate" she hopes to achieve in just three weeks. However, as becomes obvious, the Professor does not care about his student's qualifications or abilities. All he wants is to display his own erudition and subdue the young woman's spirit and body. For this teacher, the only way to assure himself of his own existence, as professor, as male, as authority, is to assert his total rule over another. And what better object could there be for him than a youthful, powerless female. Ionesco's prefatory notes indicate that during the course of the play the student will change from a "lively, gay, dynamic" person to one who is depressed and "passive," while the middle-aged professor will change from a "polite," "timid," "inoffensive" teacher to a "nervous, aggressive, dominating" master (45-46).[1] The professor derives energy and self-definition by overcoming the female student.

[1] *Four Plays:* The Bald Soprano, The Lesson, Jack or the Submission, The Chairs, trans. Donald M. Allen (New York: Grove P, 1958) 45-46.

During the arithmetic lesson we see that the professor is incapable of explaining mathematical concepts. He abandons this field for philology, even though his maid Marie warns him that it leads to "calamity" (60). This is our first hint that he has had previous pupils like the young lady, and that all has not gone well in the past. Philology becomes a weapon. As one critic writes, "language becomes a self-perpetuating means to power, even the power to kill."[2] The Professor warns the pupil that "[e]very tongue - you must know this, miss, and remember it *until the hour of your death* . . . is at bottom nothing but language"(62). At first the pupil attempts to speak up and show she understands some facet of his lecture, but increasingly the teacher suppresses her responses and denigrates her until she becomes physically ill.

The professor's sadistic nature becomes apparent as he refuses to allow the pupil to withdraw from the lesson, becoming more and more authoritarian. "Forget about your toothache," he commands (66). His orders to "take notes . . . repeat after me . . . pay attention . . . follow carefully . . . translate" (67) escalate finally to "Silence! Or I'll bash in your skull!" (70). Richard Schechner, writing about the structure of Ionesco's works, states that "the verbal language of the Professor's lecture is the worded manifestation of the language of sexual power."[3] Eventually the Professor threatens the pupil with the *word* for knife, while waving a phantom knife before her. The final gestural and verbal interplay between teacher and student, with the teacher commanding and threatening and the pupil in an agony of physical and emotional pain, becomes a horrifying indictment of educational systems and pedantic aggression, played out in terms of the rule of language and male sexual domination.[4] The professor's "knifing" of the female student ends with a clearly ejaculative shudder running through his body.

Ionesco seems to locate the source of the Professor's harmful attitudes and actions within his psyche. In his childish responses to his housekeeper Marie, we see the Professor enacting the rebelliousness of a child whose sexual and egotistical urges have been unsuccessfully repressed. He attempts to project his faults onto both Marie and his pupil. Further, when the Professor dons a Nazi armband, Ionesco implies that repressions and authoritarianism can contribute to the formation of Fascism.[5] At the end of the play, Marie

---

[2] Ingrid H. Coleman, "The Professor's Dilemma: The Absurd Comic Principle in Ionesco's *La Leçon* ," *PCL* 7 (1981): 45.

[3] "*The Bald Soprano* and *The Lesson* : An Inquiry into Play Structure," *Ionesco: A Collection of Critical Essays* , ed. Rosette C. Lamont (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1973) 29.

[4] Robin Lakoff's seminal study, *Language and Woman's Place* (New York: Octagon, 1976), analyzes the many ways that language shapes the status of women in relationship to men and to all of society.

[5] The psychologist Wilhelm Reich, in his 1933 *The Mass Psychology of Fascism* , trans. Vincent R.

ushers in a new pupil - one we can guess will meet the same fate as her predecessor. We realize that this teacher is incapable of growth, change, or self-awareness.

Like Ionesco's Professor, but to a lesser degree, Muriel Spark's Jean Brodie is a Fascist. In *The Prime of Miss Jean Brodie* , most of which takes place in the 1930s, Brodie's escalating authoritarian attitude is set "in silhouette against the rise of Fascism in Europe."[6] Brodie hopes to influence her six star pupils to satisfy her own dreams of heroism, artistic fulfillment, dedication to discipline, and elitism. She demands her pupils' loyalty and denigrates those who do not measure up to her standards. She refuses to conform to the school's antiquated teaching methods, authoritatively substituting her own standards and interests, although they may have very little relevance for her students. Jean Brodie may attract the reader's sympathy since, in a world of conformity and dullness, individualism is appealing. However, her individualism turns out to be egotistical and tyrannical.[7]

Brodie's lessons include verbal instruction in odd elements: "I will *tell* you about my last summer holiday in Egypt . . . I will *tell* you about care of the skin, and of the hands . . . about the Frenchman I met in the train to Biarritz . . . and I must *tell* you about the Italian paintings I saw" (emphasis added).[8] Her tastes are the measure of excellence: Giotto is the finest Italian painter because he is her favorite (ibid.); a girl who rolls up her shirtsleeves shows a lack of civilized nature because Brodie says so (20); "Art is greater than Science" because she declares it so (38); and six inches is the proper height for a window opened for ventilation because Brodie announces that "more is vulgar" (68).

Miss Brodie is a petty dictator, so it is no surprise that she is an open admirer of Mussolini and Hitler, and their respective blackshirts and brownshirts. Eventually Sandy, the student most closely followed in the novel, pictures the students as "Miss Brodie's fascisti, not to the naked eye, marching along, but all knit together for her need and in another way, marching along" (47-48). At another point, Sandy pictures the students as "a body with Miss

---

Carfagno (New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux, 1970), defined sexual repression and frustrated ambitions as two of the contributing factors to the rise of Fascist governmental power. Other factors he identified are "authoritarian machine civilization," distorted religious mysticism, and militarism (xiii-xiv).

[6] Peter Kemp, *Muriel Spark* (New York: Barnes & Noble, 1974) 71.

[7] One may speculate on the source(s) of Brodie's desire to assert her individual personality by dominating her students. For instance, for Ann Dobie it has demonic qualities (219), while for David Lodge it is motivated by misguided fantasy-driven romanticism (132-33). See Dobie's "*The Prime of Miss Jean Brodie* : Muriel Spark Bridges the Credibility Gap," *ArQ* 25 (1962): 217-28, and Lodge's "The Uses and Abuses of Omniscience: Method and Meaning in Muriel Spark's *The Prime of Miss Jean Brodie* ," in *The Novelist at the Crossroads and Other Essays* (New York: Cornell UP, 1971).

[8] *The Prime of Miss Jean Brodie* (1961; New York: Plume - New American Library, 1984) 18.

Brodie for the head" (45). Brodie's "heading" of these girls is apparent in her demand that they use her phrases and follow her speech closely. When Brodie is speaking of herself as being at the start of her "prime," and a young student's attention wanders, Brodie demands, "What have I been talking about?" She is satisfied when she hears her own phrase spoken back to her: "Your prime, Miss Brodie" (19).

As the novel develops, the reader becomes more and more aware of Brodie's need to live vicariously through her students and to achieve a sense of self through having an influence on the lives of her star pupils.[9] Constant verbalizations are one way this teacher manipulates her students; various forms of words like "confide," "speak," "question," "tell," and "articulate" dominate the text. In addition, Brodie is often pictured as prophetically forecasting what she hopes will happen to each girl.

In spite of Jean Brodie's efforts to dictate her pupils' futures, their lives do not follow her plans. The girls do not become famous and dedicated artists, grateful and loyal to their old teacher; in fact, they take from her very little in the way of positive lessons. One becomes a minor actress, another a nurse, another a shorthand typist, and one an undistinguished scientist. Rose and Sandy, the two girls for whom Brodie had highest hopes, actually reject her in different ways. In their late teens these two become for Brodie the means through which she hopes to satisfy her unfulfilled love for another teacher, Teddy Lloyd. "All my ambitions . . . are fixed on yourself and Rose," she tells Sandy (155). Miss Brodie plans that Rose will become Lloyd's lover, and Sandy will be Miss Brodie's informant. It is Sandy who becomes the lover, and after that, unbeknownst to Miss Brody, the person who betrays her Fascist leanings to the school headmistress. Finally, Sandy converts to a religion that Brodie has disparaged. Rose, who marries well, sheds "Miss Brodie's influence as a dog shakes pond-water from its coat" (174).

It is when Brodie becomes obsessed with the need for Rose to sleep with Teddy Lloyd that Sandy begins to think of Brodie as someone who sees herself as "Providence [;] . . . she thinks she is the God of Calvin, she sees the beginning and the end" (176). Out of her own religious need, sexual confusion, awakening political sense, and anger, Sandy "betrays" Miss Brodie, telling the headmistress of the school that Jean Brodie "is a born Fascist" (182). Sandy rejects Miss Brodie's dictatorial, telling role.

Sandy becomes a Catholic nun, Sister Helena of the Transfiguration, but as Judy Little notes, "we are never assured that Sandy's vocation is a real transfiguration."[10] Sandy never

[9] Nina Auerbach points out that at the same time that Brodie creates her own version of the six girls, they create their own version of her: a collective, mythic being. See Auerbach's "A World at War: One Big Miss Brodie," in *Communities of Women: An Idea in Fiction* (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1978) 159-91.

seems to have the peace and satisfaction a religious conversion should bring. When asked by an interviewer what were the major influences on her life, Sister Helena says there was "a Miss Jean Brodie, in her prime" (187), and the reader realizes, in a way the interviewer cannot, all the experiences encapsulated and subsumed by that statement.

Miss Brodie never understands the ways she affects her pupils, although at one moment she does regret encouraging one student to go fight for Franco in Spain, the girl having died there. She sees herself as a valuable educative force, bringing culture and refinement to her female students. She is progressive and admirable in some ways, refusing to conform to schooling standards she finds dull, repetitive, and unexciting. She is unable to see that what she offers her students is eccentrically and egotistically motivated; she is satisfying her own sexual, emotional, and pyschological needs with almost no regard for her students' real present or future situations. When Brodie dies of "an internal growth" (83) the irony is that there has been, for this teacher, *no* emotional or intellectual internal growth. She has used her students rather than educating them in any real sense.

Professor Henry Higgins, the language expert immortalized in George Bernard Shaw's 1913 *Pygmalion* , is almost as impervious to experience as Jean Brodie. From the time he first meets the poor flower girl Eliza he treats her as an object. Anyone who speaks so poorly, he insists, has "no right to live";[11] she is to him "this thing [made] out of squashed cabbage leaves" (269) and "an idiot" (276). As Higgins takes up the challenge to train her in language and decorum and pass her off as a lady, he never considers how she will feel, removed from her own class and yet not truly part of the upper crust. Writing when the play was fresh on the English scene, Richard Burton commented that "in his scientific interest in her as a phonetic problem, and his intellectual use of her to prove that duchesses can be easily manufactured . . . [Higgins] has quite overlooked the little matter of Eliza's having a soul."[12]

Like Ionesco's Professor, Higgins is a rather childish man whose sexual needs are masked or compensated for by aggressive behavior.[13] He associates sexual relationships and violence. He is appalled that Eliza wants marriage and mocks her by saying he expects her to marry someone possessing "a thick pair of lips to kiss you with and a thick pair of boots to kick you with" (279). Higgins's repressed sexuality never leads him to become murderous,

[10] *Comedy and the Woman Writer: Woolf, Spark, and Feminism* (Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1983) 135.

[11] *The Complete Plays with Prefaces* , I (New York: Dodd Mead, 1962) 206.

[12] "Pygmalion," *Bernard Shaw: The Man and the Mask* (1916; Folcroft, PA: Folcroft, 1974) 181.

[13] Arnold Silver explores the complex sexual issues at play in *Pygmalion* , including the incestuous father-daughter relationship between Higgins and Eliza, and Higgins's sexual immaturity, his sadomasochism, and his over-attachment to his mother. See "*Pygmalion* : The Two Gifts of Love," *Bernard Shaw: The Darker Side* (Stanford, CA: Stanford UP, 1982) 179-250.

but does lead to verbal aggression. His total disregard for Eliza's emotional and psychological needs can be interpreted as abusive. His housekeeper Mrs. Pearce warns him that he should not "walk over everybody" (216), and his friend Colonel Pickering asks him, "does it occur to you . . . that the girl has some feelings?" Higgins replies that he does not think so (218). In addition, Pickering warns Higgins that he must learn to know himself - this after Higgins has displayed lack of self-awareness by refusing to admit that he often swears (247).

Towards the end of the play, Higgins does begin to see his student as an independent, attractive, and able human being. When she has left his household, he has to admit that he misses her, although he cannot admit it is Eliza herself he misses, but only her ability to find things for him and to keep track of his appointments. Still, this "vulnerability," as Arnold Silver terms it, may allow the possibility of Higgins's gaining some self-awareness (194). When finally he tells Eliza that he will miss her, he says he has learned "something" from her "idiotic notions." He admits that her "soul" and her "feelings" have come to matter to him (275). He also tells her that he has grown comfortable with her voice and appearance, and would like her to come back to his household as a friend (275-76). Thus, he still does not really accept her as a sexual being or someone with independent needs and ways. Higgins's attitude towards Eliza, at the play's end, contains both surface acceptance of her individuality and deep-seated rejection of her separate being. When Eliza rebels against him, he admires her fire: "I said I'd make a woman of you; and I have" (280). Higgins may admire the transformed, independent Eliza, but he still gives himself complete credit for that transformation, never admitting that the pupil "contributed the main components, including her innate capabilities, a strong will to learn and work hard, and a desire to please teachers towards whom she felt both affection and respect" (Silver 190).

One may forgive Higgins his rudeness and tolerate his lack of manners, if one sees that he is uniformly unconcerned with others' personal lives, regardless of their class or relationship to him. He has offered Eliza what is best in him and he is glad she has learned it. While Higgins lacks civility and self-understanding, he is still a more constructive than destructive teacher.

Frank Bryant, the English professor in Lewis Gilbert's film *Educating Rita* ,[14] is someone who openly respects his pupil's individuality and also sees his own limitations. At their first meeting this alcoholic and cynical teacher self-deprecatingly asks Rita, "What can I teach you?" He admits, "[a]ll I know is that I know absolutely nothing." While *Educating*

[14] *Educating Rita* was adapted by Willy Russell from his London stage production. My comments are based solely on the film, since it is so much more widely known than the stage version; quotations are my own transcriptions from the film version. The film was directed by Lewis Gilbert and produced by William P. Cartlidge; it was released in 1983.

Rita does bear a "surface resemblance to Shaw's *Pygmalion* ,"[15] Bryant's ability to appreciate Rita's native wit, colorful language, and unpretentiousness is a far cry from Higgins's attitude towards Eliza. Bryant actually admires her fresh way of understanding literature. For instance, he tells one of his classes her definition of assonance: "getting the rhyme wrong." While his admiration for her fresh approach initially includes a touch of mockery, full-blown admiration for her insights and determination become the dominant qualities of this teacher's attitude towards his pupil. Rather than using his language to dominate this student, Bryant can delight in her individualized speech.

As Rita's education progresses, she goes through a period when she is not yet at home in academic language, but has lost her native language. She characterizes herself as a "half-caste" who cannot speak to her own people or to Frank's class. This professor continues to be supportive of his student, but his acceptance of Rita is not constant. As she progresses with her university education in literature, learning jargon and standard academic responses and losing her dependence on Frank, he becomes annoyed. Pauline Kael points out that when he "realizes he doesn't have much more to give her . . . he becomes anxious, and jealous of the students she spends time with."[16] Rita recognizes his weakness as coming from his own lack of self-confidence. She attempts to rebuild that confidence by teaching him that what he offers her is a chance to make choices and to choose a life for herself. She also tries to get Frank to stop drinking, to return to writing poetry, and to be a professor who can once more earn public respect. At the end of the movie, when Rita gives Frank a haircut, he can accept it. When she rejects his offer to go to Australia with him, he can respect her individuality.

Frank Bryant's alcoholism, cynicism, and negligent attitude in the classroom certainly indicate that he is a deeply troubled teacher. When Rita shows him what he has given her, he begins his own reeducation. He begins to realize that the schooling he offers can have deep meaning for the human being who receives it. When Rita cuts Frank's hair, in a scene fraught with remnants of the Samson-Delilah myth, it is the strength of Frank's cynicism that is being shorn away. Rita and Frank go their separate ways, but seemingly each has listened to and learned from the other.

The respect expressed by Frank Bryant for his student is exemplified when he states that she may not, in fact, now be singing a better song than the one she sang before her education, but it is "a different song." It is not *his* decision what song she should sing; she owns the tune and the words. Neither with words, nor the authority of his role within an educational institution, nor with his physical being has this teacher attempted to dominate his student.

---

[15] Judith Christ, "Heat and Chill," *The Saturday Review* 9 (Sep./Oct. 1983): 36.

[16] "The Current Cinema," *The New Yorker* 59 (14 Nov. 1983): 175.

Frank Bryant acknowledges Rita's right to her own words, her freedom of choice in what she will do and where she will go, and her right to reject his nonaggressive sexual interest in her. The other three teachers this paper has discussed do not cede such rights to their young female students. For these three teachers, the selfish desire for dominance takes precedence over the rights or needs of the student.

Henry Higgins can fleetingly acknowledge his star pupil's fire and independence, but he cannot truly accept that her song is her own. Higgins finds it unbelievable, for instance, that Eliza could be interested in Freddy, a young man he disdains and therefore expects Eliza to disdain as well. Higgins still wants to dominate the decisions Eliza makes about what she says, whom she likes, and where she will live.

The other two teachers this paper has considered are so determined to perpetuate their militantly held opinions that they cannot hear their pupils at all. Both Jean Brodie and the Professor in Ionesco's play wish to have total control of their female pupils; control of their words, actions, and their sexuality. Brodie attempts to manipulate her girls into the actions she desires; the Professor uses verbal and physical abuse to obtain his ends. These two teachers fail to offer meaningful education to their students. Their tyranny and telling block both teaching and learning.

ANNE L. BOWER

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH
OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY
MARION CAMPUS

PROFESSOR IMMANUEL RATH AND FETISHES OF POWER: STERNBERG'S *DER BLAUE ENGEL*

In her 1975 article "Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema," Laura Mulvey outlined a theory of mainstream cinema based on concepts from psychoanalysis. At the heart of her argument is the notion that the viewer who is anticipated by mainstream cinema is one whose subconscious is organized around an original fear of castration, and the pleasure available to that viewer is based in large measure on fantasies that allow escape from that anxiety.[1] The role of Woman and the images that represent her are central to this analysis since in psychoanalytic terms, it is woman's lack of the phallus that both initiates the fear of castration and symbolizes its threat. Escape from the displeasure aroused by that threat can be accomplished through manipulation of the representations of Woman in the symbolic order of which cinema is a part.

Mulvey outlines two structures whereby mainstream cinema encodes escape. The first, narcissistic scopophilia, operates on psychic structures generated during the mirror phase of human development as described by psychoanalyst Jacques Lacan. In Mulvey's terms:

> Jacques Lacan has described how the moment when a child recognizes its own image in the mirror is crucial for the constitution of the ego. . . . The mirror phase occurs at a time when the child's physical ambitions outstrip his motor capacity, with the result that his recognition of himself is joyous in that he imagines his mirror image to be more complete, more perfect than he experiences his own body. Recognition is thus overlaid with misrecognition: the image recognized is conceived as the reflected body of the self, but its misrecognition as superior projects this body outside itself as an ideal ego, the alientated subject, which, re-introjected as an ego ideal, gives rise to the future generation of identification with others. (307-08)

Films make use of this psychic pattern when they offer a powerful male protagonist with whom the viewer can identify. Like the child, the viewer experiences the joy of identification with an image more complete, more perfect than he experiences himself to be. When the protagonist is in a position of authority over a woman, as Mulvey argues is most often the case in mainstream cinema, the primary pleasure experienced by the viewer is based on his original fear of woman as symbol of castration. through the process of narcissistic scopophilia, the viewer enjoys

[1] Laura Mulvey, "Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema," *Screen* 16.3, rpt. Bill Nichols ed., *Movies and Methods* (Berkeley: U California P, 1985) 2: 306.

> . . . reenactment of the original trauma (investigating the woman, demystifying her mystery), counterbalanced by the devaluation, punishment, or saving of the guilty object. (311)

The second avenue of escape from fear of castration is fetishistic scopophilia; this process involves

> complete disavowal of castration by the substitution of a fetish object or turning the represented figure itself into a fetish so that it becomes reassuring rather than dangerous (hence overvaluation, the cult of the female star). (ibid.)

Here, Mulvey argues, the viewer is confronted directly with the spectacle of the female star who is often fragmented and stylized by close-ups. There is no mediation through a powerful male in the diegesis; rather, "the most important absence is that of the controlling male gaze within the screen scene" (312).

In illustrating her theory, Mulvey turns to the work of Alfred Hitchcock and Josef von Sternberg:

> While Hitchcock goes into the investigative side of voyeurism, Sternberg produces the ultimate fetish, taking it to the point where the powerful look of the male protagonist (characteristic of traditional narrative film) is broken in favour of the image in direct erotic rapport with the spectator. (311)

Mulvey finds Hitchcock to be more complex "as he uses both mechanisms," while Sternberg is said to have provided "many pure examples of fetishistic scopophilia" (311). The only two Sternberg films mentioned by name in the article are *Morocco* and *Dishonored*, which Mulvey uses as examples of "the cycle of films with [Dietrich]" (311-12). In light of its prominence in Sternberg's canon, it is surprising that she chose not to take specific notice of the processes at work in his first film with Dietrich, *Der blaue Engel*.

And in light of the seminal importance of Mulvey's article for psychoanalytic and feminist film criticism, it is as surprising that no one else has undertaken a study of the applicability of her theory to that film. In fact, consideration of *Der blaue Engel* in terms of Mulvey's categories yields an interesting *variation* on her conclusions rather than confirmation of the theory as she has expounded it. Sternberg's presentation of Dietrich as Lola Lola does

indeed provide a pure example of fetishistic scopophilia. The presentation of Professor Immanuel Rath, however, suggests a revision of Mulvey's construct.

In "the most typical Dietrich films," Mulvey finds that the woman is presented directly to the film spectator with "little or no mediation of the look through the eyes of the main male protagonist" and that "[t]he high point of emotional drama . . . , her supreme moments of erotic meaning, take place in the absence of the man she loves in the fiction" (312). In *Der blaue Engel* , however, the viewer's gaze at Dietrich is certainly mediated through the eyes of Immanuel Rath, and Lola Lola's supreme moments of erotic meaning are played out for Rath. Furthermore, the film involves "the obsessive reenactment of the original trauma" which is at the heart of narcissistic scopophilia. All of these elements appear to suggest that like Hitchock, Sternberg uses both of the mechanisms Mulvey has outlined. But rather than allowing the film's viewer to enjoy the protagonist's successful demystification and/or devaluation of the frightening figure, he must watch the protagonist suffer the trauma again and again, losing successively control of his students, his position of authority, his dignity, and ultimately his life. Analyzed in Mulvey's terms, the film traces a third avenue by which the viewer torn by his fear of castration can achieve the pleasure of escape from anxiety. *Der blaue Engel* offers the viewer not vicarious victory over the dreadful symbol of anxiety, but rather avoidance of personal annihilation through the ritualistic sacrifice of the scapegoat.

The plot of *Der blaue Engel* might be described as the downfall of a respectable man because he loved the wrong woman. While this description is literally correct, it entirely misses the flavor of Emil Janning's portrayal of Immanuel Rath. In describing Heinrich Mann's 1905 novel *Professor Unrath* on which the film was based, Sternberg wrote that it was about "a teacher falling in love and marrying a cabaret singer . . . resigning his position and then using his wife to obtain a footing which enabled him to make a gambling establishment that was to settle his score with society."[2] As Gertrud Koch points out, in the novel, the protagonist

> rises to greatness as a degenerate due to his obsessive vendetta against a world of contumacious students. His antisocial acts are legitimized once he turns around the absurd precepts of society's own notion of authority and fights back.[3]

In Sternberg's film, any traces of the enterprising renegade of the prototype, who might well

[2] Josef von Sternberg, "Introduction," *The Blue Angel: An Authorized Translation of the German Continuity* , words by Robert Liebmann (London: Lorrimer, 1968) 11.

[3] Gertrud Koch, "Between Two Worlds: Von Sternberg's *The Blue Angel*, " tr. Jan-Christopher Horak, *German Film and Literature: Adaptations and Transformations*, ed. Eric Rentschler (New York and London: Methuen, 1986) 61.

have provided a viewer with pleasurable narcissistic scopophilia, have been excised.

Instead, Rath is, from the beginning of the film, portrayed as anxiety ridden, alienated, and obsessed with emblems of his own precarious authority. His alienation is illustrated first by the reaction of his maid, who is disgusted by the dusty litter in his apartment, and more importantly in his relationship with his students. His alienation from them is effectively established when one scribbles on Rath's exercise book, adding "Un" to "Rath," thus making it the word for garbage or excrement, "Unrath," and by Rath's rather astonishingly controlled initial reaction to the deed (he merely asks his form leader to erase the graffito), which suggests that this outrageous and quite personal attack might not be unique. In the face of this alienation, Rath's sense of importance and his authority over the boys are precariously maintained with the aid of fetishes such as his gradebook and rituals such as that which attends his entrance to his classroom, his humiliating and absurd instruction on the pronunciation of the English article "the," and his punitive assignment of essays.

It is clear, then, that Rath's degradation by Lola Lola is only one of many, if the most devastating, threats to the professor's manhood. Indeed his initial meeting with Lola is motivated primarily by his anxious suspicion that she represents a threat to his well-established strategies for coping.

His problems with Lola are initiated when his authority and the power of his schoolmasterly fetishes are challenged by his students' leering at pictures of the singer when they are supposed to be writing an essay assigned "with a malicious air" (Liebmann 29), the last in a series of retaliatory actions taken by Rath after the discovery of the graffito on his exercise book. Another way to put it is that the singer's photograph represents an icon or fetish which competes with Rath's emblems of power. Rath initially believes his professorial icon to be the more powerful, as he files the photograph in his notebook, repeating part of his entrance ritual, blowing his nose loudly. But when he realizes that even his form leader Angst harbors photographs, he becomes intrigued, to the point of secretly performing the same ritual he had seen the students perform: blowing on the feather skirt on one of the photographs so that the singer's thighs are revealed. By the time he actually confronts Lola Lola, it is clear that he is at least as curious about her power and its threat to his own as he is anxious to protect his students' moral health.

Although Lola does not on the plot level initiate Rath's anxiety, from the beginning of the film his losses and lacks are juxtaposed with images of her power - not personal, active authority, but rather the power she represents as a fetish object. One of the most interesting instances of this juxtaposition occurs at the very beginning of the film, before the plot begins to unfold. In the authorized translation of the film continuity, the first sequence after the credits is described thus:

> Long shot from above of the steep-pitched roofs and smoking chimneys of an old town. Cut to a narrow street: it is early morning and a number of men and women are hauling loudly cackling geese out of cages in preparation for the market. In the background, on the other side of the street, a woman is washing the glass door of a tobacconist's shop. There is a bucket on the ground beside her. Medium shot of the woman from the back as she turns a handle to raise the iron grill over the window. Close-up of the grill rising to reveal a cabaret poster showing a girl in provocative pose with the name LOLA LOLA. The camera tracks briefly backwards to frame the woman as she picks up the bucket and hurls its water at the window. The poster, being stuck to the inside of the window, remains untouched. The woman starts to wipe the window with a rag, then suddenly pauses to examine the outstretched legs of the girl in the poster. She takes a step backwards, turns toward the camera and, with her eyes still fixed on the poster, clumsily imitates LOLA's pose. Insert in close-up of a plate fixed to a door, which reads "PR. DR. RATH." (Liebmann 19)

Immediately following this sequence is the undoubtedly more memorable one in which Rath, whistling gaily, goes to feed a lump of sugar to his pet bird, only to find that it has died. This loss is never referred to again, nor does Rath seem to react to the death of his pet in any subsequent behavior in the film. The sequence appears appropriately motivated only when we realize that the film is permeated with reenactments of loss and lack. Indeed, in the opening sequence, the geese on their way to market double for the death of the bird, both of which represent loss or threat of loss. This set of sequences, the street scene and the discovery of Rath's dead bird, is a prototype for what will follow: the powerful, indeed invulnerable icon, Woman (not, indeed, any flesh-and-blood woman, not even a woman's full body as icon, but the body fragmented and stylized, represented by long legs and a provocative pose) inspires a form of reverential behavior, while the man suffers a mysterious and seemingly unmotivated loss of complex symbolic significance. Throughout the film, Lola and particularly Rath's love for Lola will be associated with bird images ranging from the twittering pair to which he awakens in Lola's room to his proud crowing at their wedding feast, to the deranged, bellowing of "Kick-a-rick-i" during his final paroxysm as he attempts to murder her. In symbolic terms, then, the death of Rath's bird, which is our initial introduction to him, functions as a symbolic enactment of the loss for which the fetish object, Lola, will become a replacement. In Mulvey's terms, the opening sequences and the symbolic development worked out in the bird imagery throughout the rest of the film illustrate "complete disavowal of castration by the substitution of a fetish object" (311). More precisely, *Der blaue Engel* as a whole illustrates Rath's attempt at a more complete disavowal of castration, loss of manhood,

by the substitution of one fetish object for another.

During Rath's second visit to the theater, in the course of which he falls completely under Lola Lola's sway, his own attachment to fetish objects associated with her becomes explicit. The visit is motivated by his desire to return her undergarments, which he had taken instead of his hat. As Rath sits at a special table above the stage as guest of honor while Lola sings, the camera pans repeatedly to what the film continuity describes as "a life-sized wooden statue of a naked woman in the form of a figurehead" (Liebmann 76). And as Rath snores in Lola's bed, he clutches a doll in his arms. The replacement of emblems of power from the classroom with fetishes related to Lola becomes complete when his headmaster removes the carnation (another emblem of Lola's power) from Rath's buttonhole and asks him, "[H]ow can you risk your whole career for the sake of a creature like that?" Rath's response, "Headmaster, I must forbid this. . . . You are speaking of my future wife!" (Liebmann 82), seals the transfer, as Rath chooses Lola's version of power over that available in the classroom.

The film seems to indicate that the choice is tragic, as Rath dies clutching the desk in his old classroom. In fact, however, the tragedy resides not in the choice of fetishes per se, but rather in Rath's transgression of a critical boundary line, the psychoanalytic significance of which we can best appreciate using Laura Mulvey's terms:

> . . . the shift from one pole [narcissistic scopophilia] to the other [fetishistic scopophilia] can structure a single text. Thus both in *Only Angels Have Wings* and *To Have and Have Not* , the film opens with the woman as object of the combined gaze of spectator and all the male protagonists in the film. She is isolated, glamorous, on display, sexualized. But as the narrative progresses she falls in love with the main male protagonist and becomes his property, losing her outward glamorous characteristics, her generalized sexuality, her showgirl connotations; her eroticism is subjected to the male star alone. By means of identification with him, through participation in his power, the spectator can indirectly possess her too. (310)

Der blaue Engel offers another example of the shift from pole to pole structuring a single text, but with opposite results. Lola Lola, too, is initially offered up to the combined gaze of protagonist and spectator, particularly during the sequence mentioned above, when Rath becomes the distinguished guest of the cabaret. But in this text, when the protagonist attempts to cross from scopophilia to possession, he fails. Lola Lola's sexuality remains generalized, and Rath is forced to suffer the humiliation of preparing her as a fetish for other men: his downward spiral begins in earnest when he is reduced to selling postcard photographs of his

wife, presumably the same photographs that brought him to her in the first place. In the next sequence, he kneels before her and pulls on her stocking, then brings her her curling tongs. As the spectator watches Rath's degradation, Lola sings off-camera, "Ein kleines Blickgeplänkel sei erlaubt Dir/Doch denke immer - Achtung vor dem Raubtier" (Liebmann 91). The warning is explicit: scopophilia is safe; attempted possession is not. Whereas Lola Lola as fetish (overvalued, stylized, fragmented, invulnerable because unattainable) gives power, the same woman approached in human terms threatens castration. Rather than providing a powerful hero with whom the spectator can mis-identify, a conduit for the spectator's vicarious possession of the woman, this film offers a spectacle which corresponds precisely to the terrible fantasy harbored by the viewer. The pleasure offered is the spectator's sense of escape from the fate he fears through the sacrifice of the scapegoat.[4]

Considered in these terms, *Der blaue Engel* contains a powerful message about dangers against which *it* , and other films like it, provide the best defense. Like a wild beast, the unrestrained woman approached directly poses a desperate threat; transformed into an icon, a fetish object, and exhibited behind glass (as in the opening sequence), across the proscenium arch (as on the stage of The Blue Angel within the diegesis), or on the screen (as in the theater where the spectator is seated), she offers a pleasurable sense of power.

KENITH L. SIMMONS

HUMANITIES DIVISON
UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII AT HILO

[4] Koch notes that the film offers "images [which] make it easy to reconstruct psychoanalytically the family drama of little Jonas [Sternberg's original name] . . . . The many years during which Sternberg stood under his mother's authority [in Austria while his father was in America seeking his fortune] never allowed him to believe in the myth of the 'weaker sex.' Thus Marlene Dietrich wears the signs and insignia of a phallic mother, of a strong woman" (68).

"OH MY; I AM THE TEACHER": LAURA INGALLS WILDER AND THE PRAIRIE SCHOOLTEACHER

In the seven autobiographical novels which comprise the perennially popular Little House books, Laura Ingalls Wilder chronicles an eager girl's entry into Western womanhood. A key event in that process occurs in the last book, *These Happy Golden Years* , when, at fifteen, Laura Ingalls teaches her first school. As she opens the schoolhouse door, terrified, she meets the curious gaze of five pupils and surveys the scene: "In the corner . . . stood a small table and a chair. 'That is the teacher's table,' Laura thought, and then, 'Oh my; I am the teacher.'"[1]

Few reversals are so abrupt. In an instant, Laura is catapulted to new authority and pushed to perceive time, possibility, and her female selfhood in cataclysmally different ways. Once she has taught, she will never be the same; she can never really return to the cosy knot of children around the stove. Laura's brief teaching career is the climax of her childhood and the launching of a new story of adult life. As such, it is quite as important as her marriage, which ends the series. When her protagonist confronts the unbelievable fact that *she* is the teacher, Wilder introduces her young readers to the complex equation of love and work in a setting they know well: the classroom.[2]

For Laura Ingalls, teaching is a female heritage. Her omnicompetent "Ma" was a teacher before she married "Pa." Pa's impulse is always to venture farther west, where there is plenty of unspoiled land but where, as Ma pointedly reminds him, there are "no schools for the children."[3] Like Pa, Laura identifies school with confining stability. When, nearly eight years old, she is marched off with her older sister Mary for her first day of school, Laura is fearful and resistant. But she is soon won by the teacher, "a beautiful young lady" (149). Laura's teacher troubles do not begin until she is fourteen. By then, studious Mary has been blinded by scarlet fever, and Pa tells Laura, "You know Ma was a teacher, and her mother before her. Ma's heart is set on one of you girls teaching school, and I guess it will have to be you"[4]

By the time of Laura's first schooldays, in the 1870s, the campaign to provide qualified female teachers for Western schools, led by Catherine Beecher, had succeeded in transforming

---

1 (New York: Harper, 1943) 16.

2 Although scholarship on Wilder is beginning to proliferate, no one has yet explored this relationship between Laura's maturation and her teaching career. The one book-length critical study of her work, by Janet Spaeth, leaves this subject untouched *(Laura Ingalls Wilder* [Boston: Twayne, 1987]).

3 *On the Banks of Plum Creek* , 1937 (New York: Harper, 1953) 285.

4 *On the Shores of Silver Lake* , 1939 (New York: Harper, 1953) 127.

the popular American "image of 'teacher' to exemplary woman."[5] Although the one-room "common schools" which Laura attended could be taught by anyone who had attained the age of sixteen, passed an examination, and been hired by a school board, female schoolteachers commanded considerable prestige, and the work was more lucrative than any of the few other jobs Laura's parents considered respectable for a single woman.[6] Thus Laura feels compelled to aim for such work, in order to fulfill Ma's wish and to advance the family's plans to send Mary to a college for the blind. To her, too, the female teacher represents propriety and mastery, and she has been taught to give her teachers unquestioning respect. But as she begins to realize that teaching is her own future, Laura also learns to evaluate her teachers and to ponder the various ways they may fail.

In *The Long Winter*, for example, Teacher is Miss Garland, who is kind and competent with the lessons. But there is a near-fatal gap in her knowledge: this teacher does not understand the imperatives of prairie weather. When a blizzard hits the schoolhouse, she is obviously uncertain, and Laura, veteran of a previous winter, thinks, "'I ought to tell her what to do.' . . . But she could not think what to do."[7] When a townsman arrives, Teacher surrenders her authority to him and instructs her pupils to follow. But the man is a prairie novice too; he leads the children toward death on the open prairie. Laura cannot bring herself to defy classroom authority. "Teacher had told them to follow. . . . Laura felt that they were going in the wrong direction. . . . There was nothing to go by - no sun, no sky, no direction in the winds blowing fiercely from all directions" (89-90). Finally, Laura chances to bump a building, hails the others, and they feel their way to the safety of Main Street. But Laura has glimpsed a terrible paradigm of what school can be like if one is the pupil of an inadequate teacher. In the nightmarish, obliterating storm, all signs and authority are swallowed up, and her only protection is her own intuition, which she is not free to trust. For these pupils - as for most of us, at one time or another - a teacher's error of judgment can be a matter of life and death.

In the next book, *Little Town on the Prairie*, the new teacher is a Miss Wilder, and Laura, honoring matrilineal authority, argues that she *must* "know how to teach. She has a certificate."[8] But Miss Wilder commits blunder after blunder: she chooses malicious Nellie Oleson as her favorite; she spouts platitudes about an egalitarian classroom, and she denies the

[5] Nancy Hoffman, *Woman's "True" Profession: Voices from the History of Teaching* (Old Westbury, NY: Feminist P, 1981) 11.

[6] Although Janet Spaeth (cited above) offers an interesting discussion of Ma as Western woman (36-46), she does not discuss Ma's teaching experience. Polly Kaufman provides another valuable discussion of teaching as a frontier profession for women, in *Women Teachers on the Frontier* (New Haven: Yale UP, 1984).

[7] 1940 (New York: Harper, 1953) 85-86.

[8] 1941 (New York: Harper, 1953) 125.

necessity of discipline. This quickly leads to disaster, and the schoolroom becomes a circus of pranks and disorder.

Laura is further angered by Miss Wilder's harsh treatment of Laura's little sister Carrie, and despite Ma's remonstrance that she should never criticize a teacher, she concludes, rebelliously, that the new teacher is "unfair" and lacks "good judgment" (153). If she is to become a thoughtful, self-sufficient adult, Laura must learn to make such evaluations. As she does so, she discovers her own power in the chaotic classroom. The unruly boys look to her for encouragement and approval; with a frown or smile she can subdue them or egg them on. When Carrie is humiliated by being forced to continue rocking the loose seat she was unconsciously moving while she studied, Laura is overcome by "fury." She assumes the seat-rocking herself, and the sound of her enraged movement fills the classroom. "THUMP, *THUMP!* THUMP, *THUMP!* No one could study now" (162). Like an insistent heartbeat, the sound of Laura's angry energy fills the room, and the school is destroyed by her will.

By developing her judgment and exercising her powers of will and influence, Laura has paradoxically endangered all the pupils, including herself. She worries, "'Oh, we must not have trouble in school!' She must be able to study and get a teacher's certificate" (153). In other words, she cannot study to be a teacher unless she suppresses the very qualities she will need when she becomes one.

Miss Wilder obviously recognizes Laura as a powerful potential rival; she tells the school board that "It is Laura Ingalls who makes all the trouble in this school" (180). Laura is dumbfounded at such a lie, and Ma and Pa question her closely. The episode ends when Ma asks for Laura's autograph album and ceremoniously writes, in a teacher's copybook hand, this verse:

> If wisdom's ways you wisely seek,
> Five things observe with care,
> To whom you speak,
> Of whom you speak,
> And how, and when, and where.
>
> [Signed] Your loving mother
> C. Q. Ingalls (184)

Laura's conflict with a female teacher has complicated her life with hard, contradictory lessons. Pa and Ma force her to realize that Teacher is a human being with complex motivations, not simply a generic authority figure. And yet, when Ma inscribes her homiletic verse, she both reasserts the authority of the ultimate female teacher - herself - and reminds

Laura of the ultimate power of language. Ma's verse has an almost iconic power.[9] It reminds Laura that words must be rigorously controlled, and sometimes repressed, and that anger must be *contained*. Earlier, Laura had enjoyed devising a spirited, malicious verse about Miss Wilder, "lazy, lousy, Lizy Jane" (174), but was appalled when the boys appropriated her words and chanted them everywhere. As a teacher, she will dictate language to children. As Ma's careful, impeccable verse reminds her, those words must be chosen with extreme care. In Victorian America, women were schooled to repress anger, rebellion, and the language of a fully articulated selfhood. In *Little Women*, for example, the irrepressible Jo is encouraged to model herself after her mother, compressing her lips and containing her anger, unexpressed.[10] Ma's lesson, which consolidates all the instructive weight of teacher, mother, and language, conveys the same message. It reminds us that, in the 1880s, even in the rawest frontier village, the pressures of "true womanhood"[11] bear insistently on a girl as spirited as Laura.

Miss Wilder disappears ignominiously at the end of one term, and Laura's last two teachers are competent men, whom she never questions. But she cannot return to unreflective acquiescence. The case which she ponders most deeply is that of Willie Oleson, a "bright enough" boy who simulated retardation to tease Miss Wilder, who was taken in and "required nothing of him." The next teacher followed suit. Now Willie habitually lapses into his act, and Laura fears it is no longer an act. The second male teacher whips him thoroughly and informs him that he will be expected to learn with the others. Intimidated by discipline, Willie begins to "try . . . to think. . . . Laura often wondered whether he could pull his mind together after he had let it go to pieces so"(270), and she never can decide what to think of Mr. Owen's punishment of Willie. As she turns this case over in her mind, she is thinking of education in broader and more reflective ways. The most alarming implication of Willie's story is that a child can regress in the classroom, perhaps permanently. Whatever later teachers do, they may not be able to reverse the pattern of debilitation which Miss Wilder allowed to begin. Laura wonders whether the vigorous physical punishment is a salutary corrective or mere brutality. The case of Willie Oleson emphasizes how much is at stake in the schoolroom, and how irrevocable a teacher's influence can be.

---

[9] The verse is reproduced in Ma's handwriting. It is one of the few facsimiles Wilder incorporates into her text; others include Laura's first teaching certificate and one of her name cards.

[10] *Little Women*, 1868 (Boston: Little, Brown, 1968) 72-75 and passim. Jane Tompkins provides a discussion of the female ethic of suppression as expressed in sentimental fiction by and for women, in her chapter on Susan Warner's *The Wide, Wide World*, in *Sentimental Designs: The Cultural Work of American Fiction* (New York: Oxford UP, 1985) 147-85.

[11] The phrase is from historian Barbara Welter, who provides an early and influential discussion of this phenomenon in *Dimity Convictions: The American Woman in the Nineteenth Century* (Athens: Ohio UP, 1976).

Laura's rite of passage, from pupil to teacher, is the school exhibition, her first public performance. Suddenly, the whole town's attention is riveted on the work of the schoolroom. The climax of this heightened, portentous evening is Laura's starring role: singlehandedly, she recites the first half of U.S. history. These years of expansion and growth are Laura's favorite part of her favorite subject. In the audience, she meets Pa's "shining" eyes; "he slowly nodded his head. Then she was really launched on the great history of America. She told of the new vision of freedom" and ends as "the first wagon wheels rolled into Kansas" (*Little Town on the Prairie* 291, 293).

By her study of history, Laura has internalized the calendar of her culture and brought passion and imagination to her texts. History links her to Pa's frontier vision. Laura ends her recital at the very place where her own pioneering began - when she was five and the Ingalls's wagon "rolled into Kansas." Now her own story is joined with American history and Laura's private and public lives are triumphantly one. After this experience, she will never return to school as a pupil only. A member of the enthusiastic audience comes the next day to ask her to teach a newly organized country school. Laura is quickly awarded a coveted third-grade certificate and suddenly the fifteen-year-old girl is officially a teacher.

When she takes her place at the teacher's table, she faces her first experience in independently creating and maintaining order out of the raw materials of her own insight and will. The Little House books are marked throughout by Laura's intense interest in *work* , in how and why it is done. Whether she is watching the railroad men or helping Ma make beds, she is sensitive to the rhythm by which work proceeds. But always before, someone else has established the rhythm, called the tune. Now, the first third of *These Happy Golden Years* is dominated by the rhythms of her first eight-week term of school. Anxiously, she counts days, hours, and minutes. When she meets her pupils and discovers what they know, she immediately invents a pattern for the days. The worst specter of Laura's schoolroom past is Miss Wilder, who could not *keep order* , so she defends herself and her pupils against chaos.

But she must also reckon with two other powerful forces. One is weather. In midwinter, she must find a way to maintain discipline in a room so cold that students must leave their seats to huddle near the stove. Even the superintendent emphasizes this force. His address to the school is one sentence: "Whatever else you do, *keep your feet warm* " (84). Laura must avoid the errors of Miss Garland, who nearly lost her scholars to blizzard weather.

A second, even more difficult problem for Laura is maintaining distance from her students. She is a homesick girl away from home for the first time. Her pupils are her only peers; some are as old as she, and taller. With them, physical discipline would be impossible,

and, moreover, Laura is not sure she approves of such punishment. So the students' friendliness is very tempting, and on the third day she joins in their snowball fight. The repercussions are immediate: "That very afternoon Clarence pulled Martha's hair" (29). Laura's new order begins to fail. By the end of the second week, she is overwhelmed by "despair." "She was too little . . . she could not interest them . . . they were all against her, she could not discipline them." Now she identifies with her worst teacher, "Miss Wilder who had failed to teach the school in town. 'This is the way she felt,' Laura thought" (52, 54). By the second Friday, time, order, and work have no meaning in her classroom.

On her weekend visit, Laura breaks her silence and confesses her troubles to her family, gathering the strength of their concern and advice to take back to school. Carrie, still a child, suggests that Laura refer her problems to male authority and ask a member of the school board to whip the most troublesome boy. Laura protests, "How can I tell the school board that I can't manage the school?" (57). In this crucial chapter, titled "Managing," Pa and Ma try to teach Laura to exert her will over children and time. Pa cautions against "brute force": "Everybody's born free, you know. . . . You better just manage" (58). And Ma gives practical advice on how to do so, based on her experience as teacher and mother. Ma understands unruly Clarence: "It's attention he wants; that's why he cuts up" (58), she says. Laura has been so caught up in *her* needs and *her* role that she has not been able to perceive the complexities of her students. When she takes Ma's insight back to her classroom, matters begin to improve. Now Laura is more attentive to her pupils' individual needs, and they begin really to learn.

Laura's feelings of desperation are exacerbated by the fact that she is boarding out, sharing a cramped claim shanty with the Brewsters. Young Mrs. Brewster is angry and hostile; trapped with her baby in what she considers a "dreadful country" (67), she resents Laura's relative mobility and independence as a female teacher. One night Laura is awakened by a scream and peers through the thin curtain separating the beds to see the wife threatening her husband with a butcher knife. The scene has the nightmare intensity of Bertha Mason's appearance in Jane Eyre's bedroom; the madwoman in the attic is now the frontier wife. Laura does not like teaching. But the only alternative which she knows for a young woman - the alternative which ended Ma's teaching career - is marriage, which could land her in the very life Mrs. Brewster is enduring. Laura's life is tightening like a vise. The demands of the schoolroom are stringent, and when she leaves them for nights at the Brewsters', she enters an even more untenable alternative. Haunted by the knife, Laura is afraid to sleep. Her only avenue of escape is into her schoolbooks; every night she studies furiously to keep up with her class in town. Why is she studying so hard? So she can remain a teacher.

In such circumstances, when young Almanzo Wilder appears every weekend with an offer of a ride home, Laura is eager to go. She loves the speed, the distances, and the escape

from confinement, and Almanzo's swift, beautiful horses are sexually evocative. Yet everything she has learned at the Brewsters' inclines her to evade sexual commitments, and Laura denies what is apparent to everyone else: that Almanzo is her beau. During the weekends with her family, Laura must also suppress her terror of the knife. "If they knew, they would not let her go back. . . . A teacher could not walk away and leave a term of school unfinished. If she did, she would not deserve another certificate, and no school board would hire her" (86).

Now Laura is thinking of herself as a teacher. On the last day of school, she realizes that that new identity is now her own. The teacher's table is no longer strange to her, and within the order she has invented, lessons are "well learned" and pupils are "well-behaved" (90). At the end of the day, Laura presents each pupil with one of her treasured name cards, printed with her full name and a Victorian spray of flowers. On the back she has inscribed, "Presented to -----, by her teacher, with kind regards" (ibid.). Through her successful teaching, Laura Elizabeth Ingalls has taken full possession of her own name. She is not timid Miss Garland nor injudicious Miss Wilder nor even Ma, and none of her pupils has risked the terrible loss of a Willie Oleson. Instead, through her teaching Laura has staked a claim to her identity as successful, independent woman.

Of course, she is delighted to return to her parents' house, to life as a child and a student, and she professes to wish she could live thus always. But in fact, Laura's teaching has given her confidence and motivation which preclude such regression. When Laura is offered salaried work, she takes it, saying, "I feel I ought to be earning something" (137). When Almanzo invites her for nonutilitarian sleigh rides, she accepts, just as she will eventually accept his marriage proposal. Before her marriage, she will successfully teach another school. For Laura Ingalls, her frontier teaching is a necessary step by which she takes possession of female selfhood, in a world which is inclined to contain, constrict, and deny it.

Fifty years later, when Laura Ingalls Wilder began in her sixties to write her Little House novels, she drew on the same strengths which Laura Ingalls discovered in her classrooms. About the books, Wilder said, "I wanted the children now to understand more about the beginnings of things, to know what is behind the things they see - what it is that made America as they know it. Then I thought of writing the story of my childhood in several volumes."[12] In those volumes, Wilder made the same passionate connection between private and public time that Laura discovered in her girlhood history recitation, and she claimed a language which brings her own beginnings to vigorous, common life. Becoming a teacher, Laura Ingalls became herself. And when she became the writer of the Little House books,

[12] Laura Ingalls Wilder and Rose Wilder Lane, *A Little House Sampler* , ed. William T. Anderson (Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1988) 217.

Laura Ingalls Wilder reclaimed the hard-won skills of language, invention, and self-knowledge which were forged at Brewster School, where she first discovered that "Oh my; I am the teacher."[13]

ANN ROMINES

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH
GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
WASHINGTON, D.C.

[13] This essay was written in honor of my four grandparents, all of whom taught in the rural schools of Missouri.

NOTES ON THE DRY EUCALYPTUS: WALLACE STEVENS'S PROFESSORIAL VOICES

Professor Eucalyptus - the dry eucalyptus of "An Ordinary Evening in New Haven" - may be Wallace Stevens's most distinctly drawn profile of a professorial figure. The professor "sits in his room, beside / The window, close to the ramshackle spout in which / The rain falls with a ramshackle sound."[1] But this portrait of the academic withdrawn from professorial process is balanced in the Stevens corpus by *Notes toward a Supreme Fiction* 's fuller, though subtler, more indirect, view of the most salient features of the professorial *in* process. The poem begins with a lecture by an unspecified tutor to an only vaguely seen pupil: the "ephebe." Also unidentified is the purpose (and therefore, in Aristotelian terms, the nature) of the instruction. Usual commentary on the poem construes the lecture subject as the writing of poetry: the lecturer becomes a modern-day (one supposes) Horace presenting a lesson in the art of poetry to one of the young Pisones. This is a view shaped by Stevens's reputation as a poet's poet for whom poetry is always literally "the subject of the poem" (*CP* 176) and the writing of poetry an endlessly self-reflective endeavor.[2] But poetry writing has its metaphorical and synechdochal possibilities as well as the literal (even assuming that any possibility can be accurately identified as literal), and Stevens's teacher, with such phrases as "the extremest book of the wisest man" and "the death of one god is the death of all" (*CP* 381), seems to have more on his mind than rhymed couplet versus blank verse.

Stevens's speaker - who, along with the ephebe, passes into and out of view like Eliot's women talking of Michelangelo - takes on various rhetorical forms in his narrative formlessness. Besides Horace and the young Pisones, the poem, with its interest in "Logos and logic" (*CP* 387) and its coupling of metaphysical and martial imagery, suggests Aristotle, along with his redoubtable pupil Alexander the Great, on the subject of rationality and worldly power; we have textual reason to perceive the archangel Michael (of *Paradise Lost*) instructing Adam (who is directly mentioned in the poem [*CP* 383]) on God's plan for bringing good out of evil, and perhaps Descartes lecturing his colleagues at the Sorbonne, since Stevens's poem refers explicitly to both the philosopher and his institution (*CP* 383, 406). The image of Virgil instructing his earnest pupil Dante in *The Divine Comedy* also invades the poem in complex ways from beginning to end, the Latin epic poet even being mentioned by name in the epilogue

[1] *The Collected Poems of Wallace Stevens* (New York: Knopf, 1957) 475. Cited in the text as *CP*. Quotations from Plato's dialogues (cited in the text by page number) are drawn from *The Works of Plato* , ed. and trans. Benjamin Jowett (New York: Tudor, n.d.).

[2] Lucy Beckett, for example, remarks that "all Stevens's best poems after 'The Man with the Blue Guitar' and most of those before it" inevitably "turn out . . . to be poem[s] about poetry" (*Wallace Stevens* [Cambridge, Eng.: Cambridge UP, 1974] 172).

(*CP* 407).[3] But while acknowledging these various possibilities, I would like to concentrate (bearing in mind his unique relevance to pedagogy) on the professional example of Socrates instructing his devoted listener Glaucon (or any one of a number of other Socratic interlocutors) on the nature of reality and our relation to that nature, tracing the poem's recurrent reimaginings and revisions of the lover of wisdom and the lover's journey from ordinary experience to extraordinary "reality."

The poem from its opening rhetorical question experiences the lecturer's quest in doubly erotic/Socratic terms:

> And for what, except for you, do I feel love?
> Do I press the extremest book of the wisest man
> Close to me, hidden in me day and night? (*CP* 380)

The erotic content is here underscored by an interrogative strategy which itself marks a Socratic brand of eros energizing the text and its participants. Whatever it may be that compels us beyond "the extremest book of the wisest man," its attractive force recalls Socrates's characterization (in the *Symposium* and elsewhere) of the wisest philosopher as only the one with the most perfect love for the absolute.[4] And this connection becomes more explicit when later in *Notes* Stevens's persona declares that

> The monastic man is an artist. The philosopher
> Appoints man's place in music, say, today.
> But the priest desires. The philosopher desires. (*CP* 382)

- returning us to the opening question: For what do these personages feel love/desire? Socratic eros most generally and plainly is a love for transcendent truth. Although "supreme fiction" stands in for this ultimacy in Stevens's poem, the consuming passion for some form or forms of abstraction at least in the sense of a figuration beyond oneself seems to remain. And resurrecting the Socratic irony that the philosopher's love of wisdom presupposes its lack, [5]

[3] In this connection, Robert Rehder links Stevens's "voluminous master folded in his fire" (*CP* 381) to the image of "Ulysses wrapped in a horn of flame in *Inferno* XXXVI" (*The Poetry of Wallace Stevens* [New York: St. Martin's P, 1988] 225). For a more extended discussion of Stevens and Dante, see Glen G. MacLeod, *Wallace Stevens and Company: The Harmonium Years, 1913-1923* (Ann Arbor, MI: UMI Research P, 1983).

[4] As with Diotima's account of the adventure of the lover of wisdom in Plato's *Symposium* , leading from: "There is nothing which men love but the good" (335) to the description of "beauty only, absolute, simple, and everlasting" (342).

[5] Socrates tells Agathon in *The Symposium* , "the inference that he who desires something is in want of something, and that he who desires nothing is in want of nothing, is in my judgment, Agathon, absolutely and

the speaker in *Notes* maintains that "not to have is the beginning of desire" - then completes the ironic turn: "To have what is not is its ancient cycle" (*CP* 382).

If we sight along these denotative and connotative particulars, *Notes* directs us toward Socrates's pedagogical role in the familiar allegory of the cave portion of Plato's *Republic*. Here Socrates teaches, and by his example testifies, that a knowledge of ultimacy is utterly (though unutterably) desirable, combining, as it does, absolute truthfulness, beauty, and goodness. On the basis of such specifications, for what else, indeed, would one feel love? In parallel with *Notes*' pedagogical outlook, Socrates portrays our ordinary perceptions as fundamental delusion, disclosing "nothing but the shadows of . . . images" (266) - a version of "having what is not." The thrust of the allegory is to put this ancient cycle behind us and, under Socrates's tutelage (placing ourselves in Glaucon's reverent sandals), to have what truly *is*, as we turn our gaze "from the world of becoming into that of being, and learn by degrees to endure the sight of being, and of the brightest and best of being, or in other words, of the good" (270). While this puts Socrates at odds with Stevens's dictum "it must change," it finds all parties, like Professor Eucalyptus, feeling an impulse to preserve themselves "against the repugnant rain / By an instinct for a rainless land" (*CP* 475).

Stevens's lecturer opens "It Must Be Abstract" (*Notes*' first major section) with the instruction, "Begin, ephebe, by perceiving the idea / Of this invention, this invented world, / The inconceivable idea of the sun" (*CP* 380). This demanding beginning meets and mixes with the first words of Genesis, "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth," and with St. John's improvisation on the Genesis phrasing, "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God" (John I:1); small wonder that the poem's next section speaks of returning to "the first idea" (*CP* 381). Obviously more than a temporal concept, the "first idea" implies a Deific original essence, the earth and sun as first and fundamental creations, and, to return to our selected context, the Platonic/Socratic Ideas or Forms, which logically and temporally precede their reflection in the material world. This confluence of metaphysical possibilities does, indeed, portend a high level of abstraction, one at which assorted metaphysical systems overlay one another to yield not the abstract truth within a metaphysics but those abstract principles by which metaphysics functions. The poem seems to seek the principle of principle, a glimpse into the central workings of Socratic (and any) ideation.

The sun as central icon in *Notes* likewise unites Greek and Hebraic, as Genesis's "Let there be light" mingles with the sun as Platonic symbol for the Good. Stevens's pedagogue comes into focus against the background of Socrates's metaphorical teaching that the true light of the sun (as the "idea of the good") is the last thing to be seen, the goal of the

necessarily true" (328).

metaphysical/ontological ascent from delusion into understanding. Visioning (or envisioning) the sun, the Socratic adventurer gets beyond the uncertainty of phenomenal experience: "Last of all," teaches Socrates, he "will be able to see the sun, and not mere reflections of him in the water, but he will see him in his own proper place, and not in another; and he will contemplate him as he is" (267). The experience is, as Stevens's "The Man with the Blue Guitar" intones, "A tune beyond us as we are" (*CP* 167) - a tune replayed in the opening lines of "It Must Be Abstract."

This movement out of the ennui of phenomenal experience is a part of the methodological return to "ignorance" (ignoring the ordinary view of things) that both Socrates and Stevens's Socratic speaker recommend. *Notes* ' lecturer advises the ephebe to "become an ignorant man again / And see the sun again with an ignorant eye" (*CP* 380). While recalling Christ's elevation of childlikeness,[6] the call for a return to ignorance also repeats Socrates's admonition that a genuine comprehension of our ignorance is integral to the philosophic quest.[7] The Socratic satisfaction at seeing "the beautiful and just and good in their truth" (273) has its Stevensian counterpoint in the lecturer's exclamation, "How clean the sun when seen in its idea" (*CP* 381) - not as ideal truth but as primitive hypothesis. This leaves the teacher enduring a Socratic paradox. Though advising pupils to become childishly ignorant, the credible teacher must bring to bear a certain concentration of thought and experience - an aporia Socrates tries to skirt by calling himself a "lover of wisdom" rather than a wise man, by favoring the interrogative, and by presenting his dialogue as a joint venture with the interlocutor.

Further defining this methodological dilemma, both Plato's dialogues and Stevens's poetizing question the role of reason in the pursuit of wisdom. Without logical structure there seems little hope of progress outward/upward from the cavern of our perceptual imprisonment. Yet it is a perception and not a conception that the pedagogues pursue. Stevens's speaker signals this paradoxical intent by instructing his ephebe to "perceive" the "inconceivable idea of the sun" (which may be either an idea belonging to the sun or an idea about the sun). The "idea" is somehow to be seen and not thought; indeed, the word "inconceivable" strongly implies that it *cannot* be thought. But if it cannot be thought, can it be taught?

---

6 "Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child shall in no wise enter therein" (Luke 18:17).

7 In the *Apology* Socrates, alluding to the pronouncement by the Oracle at Delphi that "there was no man wiser" than Socrates, responds, "I know that I have no wisdom, small or great" (106), then interprets the Oracle to mean: "He, O men, is the wisest who, like Socrates, knows that his wisdom is in truth worth nothing" (109). And later in the dialogue he adds, "This is the point in which, as I think, I am superior to men in general, and in which I might perhaps fancy myself wiser than other men, - that whereas I know but little of the world below, I do not suppose that I know" (117).

Socrates, taking issue with the "professors of education"who believe "that they can put a knowledge into the soul which was not there before, like sight into blind eyes" (270), addresses the problematic in the *Republic:* while dialectical reasoning, by reorienting our visual/conceptual trajectory, delivers us from the cave to a sight of at least the shadows of real objects, perhaps even the objects themselves, that crucial step to a perception of the "idea of the good" - and likewise, Stevens's "inconceivable idea of the sun" - relies finally on the native strength of one's intuitive capacity. Emphasizing the pivotal nature of the intuitive experience, Glaucon affirms that the person emerging from the cave "would first see the sun and [only] then reason about him" in a fully developed sense (267). Stevens's professorial figure, after describing a moment of spiritual or aesthetic insight and refreshment corresponding roughly to the moment of Socratic intuition, remarks,

> We reason of these things with later reason
> And we make of what we see, what we see clearly
> And have seen, a place dependent on ourselves. (*CP* 401)

This passage, borrowing from the language of Glaucon's remark about the secondariness of reason, at the same time turns the tables on the Socratic search for the transcendental, rethinking the coordinates of intuitive geography in a way that bends "later reason" toward the mythologizing of "a place dependent on ourselves." For each of us, in the originative, intuitive moment:

> We more than awaken, sit on the edge of sleep,
> As on an elevation, and behold
> The academies like structures in a mist. (*CP* 386)

Following this line, Stevens's seeker after wisdom concretizes near the end of *Notes* as the would-be rationalist "Canon Aspirin," an aspiring if initially analgestic/antipyretic figure who, in effect combining the roles of teacher and pupil, exposes perhaps the most problematic aspect of the Stevensian or Socratic professorial model: the ambiguous relationship between pedagogue and ephebe. As Stevens sees, a potential conflict between the two lingers at the periphery of his lecturer's (and the Socratic) pedagogical project, since an all-consuming desire for ultimacy may draw the teacher too singularly toward the object of desire. The magnetizing effect is potent, as Stevens's poem "The Well Dressed Man with a Beard" describes:

> If the rejected things, the things denied,
> Slid over the western cataract, yet one,
> One only, one thing that was firm, even
> No greater than a cricket's horn, no more
> Than a thought to be rehearsed all day, a speech

> Of the self that must sustain itself on speech,
> One thing remaining, infallible, would be
> Enough. Ah! douce campagna of that thing! (*CP* 247)

As the attraction of one certain thing crowds out all others, how can the sage resist the temptation to forget, or even supplant, his ephebe? Socrates's medicine for this predicament is to force (by moral persuasion, of course) the enlightened to return to the cave and lead their brethren out. Stevens's solution seems somewhat different. After the Canon Aspirin has reached the points "Beyond which fact could not progress as fact"(*CP* 402) and "Beyond which thought could not progress as thought" (*CP* 403), he overcomes the impasse by a fictionalization in which the ephebe appears transformed from pupil into a mode of realization, his mental and spiritual progress transfiguring into a heuristic for the Canon's self-enlightenment. The Canon seems to imagine the ephebe as an angel who, dwelling in "the gold centre" (*CP* 404) of absolute truth, rejects that "centre," leaves behind the more rarefied Platonic metaphysical terrain (or, in terms more relevant to angels, the gold streets and gates of heaven), and leaps out into the nonmetaphysical "deep space"of "the evening's revelations" (ibid.). This fictionalization is a plunge into the abyss of deep space for the Canon as well; he asks, "Is it he or is it I that experience this?" (ibid.) and concludes (echoing, among others, Jehovah, Descartes, S. T. Coleridge, and Popeye the Sailor), "I have not but I am and as I am, I am" (*CP* 405) - negating, at least for that expansive moment, the desire to have what is other and experiencing/perceiving the "merely going round" as "a final good" (ibid.).

Stevens's purposive confusion or breaking down of boundaries between individuals is a natural accompaniment to his breaking beyond the limitations of rationality. And *Notes* ' pedagogical variations on the conflict between perception and conception, or experience and reason, extend from the difficult admonition to "perceiv[e] the idea / Of this invention, . . . / The inconceivable idea of the sun" to the epilogue's "war between the mind / And sky, between thought and day and night" (*CP* 407). Taking on these complications, Stevens's professorial speaker initially combines the visual aspect of the Socratic trope with an iconoclastic insistence on abstraction, instructing the ephebe to "look not at his colored eyes" and "Give him / No names" (*CP* 388), as if enduring the central absurdity of the conflict were prerequisite to a fuller vision than a Socratic adherent could manage. The Platonic and Judeo-Christian discordances are momentarily resolved, or perhaps simply abandoned, in the last two lines before the poem's epilogue as the speaker (whoever he may now be: professor, ephebe, Canon, some other, or some combination) anticipates the day when "I call you by name, my green, my fluent mundo. / You will have stopped revolving except in crystal" (*CP* 407). Here what is experienced, contrary to earlier specifications, has both name and color, and while deeply interested in Socratic workings, the result reverses the Socratic polarity. Whereas Socrates looks through phenomenal experience toward an extraphenomenal reality, Stevens's

persona visualizes the phenomenal world at the center of a crystalline encasement of ideation. The speaker, having pictured his pupil's esape not from the cave but from the allegory of the cave, now finds his fluent world revealed within the conception of that escape. Stevens's lecturer (or listener) pursues a "final" vision of a nonmetaphysical good - a perception dependent on breaking the hold of such powerful, reality-producing tropes as the Platonic allegory. He declares that

> They will get it straight one day at the Sorbonne.
> We shall return at twilight from the lecture
> Pleased that the irrational is rational. (*CP* 406)

Here the eidetic sun fades into twilight, Cartesian reality bends (emphasized by the pun on the word "straight") to accommodate the irrational element, and we return from the formality of the Sorbonne lecture to enjoy a twilit (and in that sense, "ignorant") vision of the green earth.

Where, then, does this boldly anti-Platonic improvisation on the Socratic model leave the image of the teacher in Stevens's poem? The poem suggests something of the way in which inspired teaching may be possible only in relation to a subtext of desire and resolution of the sort the Canon visualizes, one which indirectly reveals, as Stevens says elsewhere, "the precious portents of our own powers."[8] The lecturer sets out ostensibly to teach but ends by discovering a kind of erotic encounter with his own conceptualization made perceptible in the pupil's hypothetical receipt of it. Thinking in this sense becomes by pedagogical practice a kind of writing whose destiny is realized only in being received. If the world by a later reasoning becomes a place dependent on oneself, the Stevensian teacher by an incalculable leap of intuition depends, more than dialectically, on his/her pupil. Stevens's poem proposes that "two things of opposite natures seem to depend / On one another" (*CP* 392); in what follows in the poem, we find that the appearance of opposition itself is actually an unstable conceptualization. The teacher/pupil dichotomy yields to the nondialogical mutuality of an empathetic fictionalization in which the love of learning (and should we include supreme poetizing?) precipitates a sort of ménage à trois - or else the teacher (and is it possible, the poet?) becomes a distant and pallid voyeur.

JAMES S. LEONARD

ENGLISH DEPARTMENT
THE CITADEL
CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA

---

[8] *The Necessary Angel: Essays on Reality and the Imagination* (New York: Knopf, 1951) 175.

THE TEACHER AS FAILURE - THE TEXT AS TEACHER: HERMANN BROCH'S "DIE VIER REDEN DES STUDIENRATS ZACHARIAS"

Throughout most of his life as an author Hermann Broch was concerned with the problem of *Erkenntnis* and how to communicate knowledge through writing, especially in order to be effective in the political workings of the world. His uncertainty about the best means for accomplishing this task is reflected in his use of varied types of prose: literary fiction, philosophical essays, and political treatises. Shortly before the Austrian *Anschluß* his doubts about the effectiveness of literature became strongest, and, except for the thematization of the powerlessness of literature in his novel *Der Tod des Vergil* , which he completed in exile, he turned away from fiction during World War II to devote more attention to other activities.[1] Broch's concern with the transmission of knowledge makes him in a sense a sort of teacher, and his employment of different forms of writing and intellectual activity represents a search for the best didactic means.

In 1949 Broch returned his attention to literature and wrote six novellas, which he combined with five tales that he had written before World War II. The collection was published the next year as *Die Schuldlosen: Roman in elf Erzählungen* . Rather than dealing with *Erkenntnis* and political action in a general sense, these texts attempt to come to terms with the rise of Nazism, especially as it took hold among the middle classes. Instead of dealing directly with major political events or the most blatant excesses of the period, however, Broch created a number of narratives that examine representative individuals. The protagonist of "Die vier Reden des Studienrats Zacharias," written in 1949 but set in 1923, is a schoolteacher, a seemingly appropriate choice of professions when one considers the didactic nature of Broch's own task. Zacharias is, however, a rather unsympathetic figure: instead of recognizing the mentality that is leading to Fascism or acting as an influence that might counter it, he actually embodies many of its most dangerous tendencies. Because a phenomenon such as Nazism is

[1] Most works on Broch give an account of his writings in these various areas. For a good overview see Ernestine Schlant, *Hermann Broch* (Boston: Twayne, 1978). The subtitle of the volume edited by Stephen D. Dowden, *Hermann Broch: Literature, Philosphy, Politics* (Columbia, SC: Camden House, 1988), indicates that all three areas are considered in this collection of articles. According to Dowden, Broch is different from most writers because he crosses intellectual boundaries: he "opposed the disintegration of knowledge into autonomous compartments" ("Introduction: Literature, Philosophy, Politics and the Challenge of Hermann Broch" [1]). Paul Michael Lützeler says that "Broch knew in 1936 that art cannot directly influence practical life and he drew the consequences." Yet near the end of his life he made a "hesitant return" to what Lützeler calls "positive aesthetics" and literary writing: "The Avant-Garde in Crisis: Hermann Broch's Negative Aesthetics in Exile," ibid. 26-29.

most dangerous when embraced or at least unopposed by a significant portion of the populace, an analysis that focuses on teachers, a group that should be expected to show more perception and to instruct others in a better way, might effectively highlight the workings of this ideology.[2] In Broch's text, however, the teaching proceeds in something other than an exemplary, straightforward manner.

Zacharias is identified in the opening sentence of Broch's tale as a mathematics teacher, but the narrator ironically comments on what is probably a more important aspect of his character by immediately adding that he holds the Iron Cross, Second Class. He has joined the Social Democratic Party, but only because that party is the one that has succeeded in achieving power after the Kaiser's departure at the end of World War I, and Zacharias is accustomed "seine Ansichten widerspruchslos von den jeweiligen Machthabern zu beziehen" (141).[3] His military demeanor and values are further indicated by the way he raises his children and by his fantasies about the authoritarian manner in which he would run a *Gymnasium* , should he ever be promoted to principal (141-42). In much of his work Broch was concerned about the contemporary *Zerfall der Werte*, and Zacharias's lack of a coherent value system is graphically symbolized by the heterogeneous pantheon he displays on his living room wall: the Social Democratic leaders Bebel and Scheidemann on either side of the triumvirate Wilhelm II, Hindenburg, and Ludenforff. Zacharias is trying artificially to force contradictory parts into a total *Weltanschauung* . Similar inconsistencies are revealed in his attitude toward Einstein and the theory of relativity; his attendance at a rally protesting that theory begins the actual plot of this tale. The narrator informs us through indirect interior monologue that as a mathematician and a Social Democrat, Zacharias supports Einstein, but as a teacher of young people he finds it pedagogically unsound constantly to introduce new material, since such a practice would deny pupils a sense of certainty and allow them to raise premature and embarrassing questions; he thinks that teachers have a right to expect *Wissenschaftsabgeschlossenheit* (142). It is later

[2] Most of the scholarly treatments of Broch's literary works are devoted to the three lengthy novels that have a more obviously unified form: *Die Schlafwandler, Der Tod des Vergil,* and *Die Verzauberung* . Michael Winkler's "Broch's Roman in elf Erzählungen," *Hermann Broch* , ed. Paul Michael Lützeler (Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp, 1986) 183-98, makes important observations in its defense of the structure of this text, but it does not treat all the aspects that I wish to stress here. Manfred Durzak's "Zwischen Satire und Pathos: Die Möglichkeiten des Erzählers Hermann Broch in den *Schuldlosen, Broch heute* , ed. Joseph Strelka (Bern and Munich: Francke, 1978) 133-54, correctly recognizes that Broch is more effective in conveying a message through satire than through an unvarnished statement of a truth. In my essay, however, I treat satire as only one part of the means employed. Other scholars deal with *Die Schuldlosen* in general or with other aspects than those I discuss here; none is devoted solely to the multidimensionality of the formal effectiveness of "Die vier Reden."

[3] Page numbers in the text refer to Hermann Broch, *Die Schuldlosen: Roman in elf Erzählungen* , vol. 5 of *Kommentierte Werkausgabe* (Frankfurt/M: Suhrkamp, 1974), 13 vols.

made obvious that anti-Semitism also plays a role in his opposition to Einstein (144).

Most of the narrative consists of Zacharias's own words, however, in conversation with the young man identified only as A., whom Zacharias meets at the close of the rally and who invites the schoolteacher to a tavern. Here, after successive bottles of wine, Zacharias delivers the four monologic speeches referred to in the title and more directly shows himself as a martinet: he pedantically offers advice to A.; he examines him on his background and views (though he never succeeds in learning more than the initial of the young man's name, even after drinking to their brotherhood and employing the familiar *du*); he stands up to make his speeches in pompous, flowery language; and he constantly stresses the superiority of his own views and those of his nation. His first speech condemns the hypocrisy of the victors and neutrals in World War I (A. is a Dutchman), and he thinks that only the Germans are fit to be the teachers <*Lehrmeister*> of the world, because they are the only ones who lack hypocrisy (148-50). The second speech, more abstract and somewhat muddled, praises the loyalty of his wife and the *Unendlichkeit* in which the Germans live (151-53). After drinking to his new relationship with A., Zacharias praises brotherhood as superior to love: whereas love attempts to cheat death though an apparent self-dissolution, brotherhood actually embraces death and is best exemplified in the army (157-59). His final speech renonces liberty and equality, but says that genuine German democracy will create a new *Internationale* on its path to the infinite (164-65).

Because of the narrator's ironic judgments in the story's opening paragraphs and because the benefit of hindsight allows one to compare these speeches with what the supposedly superior Germans actually brought about in the recent past, it is unlikely that a reader would receive Zacharias's remarks in anything other than a critical fashion. Moreover, their muddled logic and bombastic phrasing work against an acceptance of these speeches as expessions of truth. Satire thus provides the main didactic vehicle, and to Durzak, it is this element that operates most effectively. By way of contrast, the beekeeper, who appears in other tales of *Die Schuldlosen* , serves as a positive example to express proper thinking more directly to the reader. As a variation on the Commandant from Mozart's *Don Giovanni* - the narrative in which he appears is entitled "Steinerner Gast" - he is an admonitory figure who chastises A. for weaknesses that led to the suicide of the beekeeper's foster daughter. Yet as Durzak observes, "Niemand wird die Gutgemeintheit des moralischen Appels in Zweifel ziehen, aber seine sentenzhafte Allgemeinheit verleiht ihm spruchbandhafte Abstraktheit" ("Zwischen Satire und Pathos" 141). In relating the beekeeper's insight, the author thus appears to subordinate the aesthetic to the ethical (142). But in the novel Broch is successful only where "das Pathos der heilsgeschichtlichen Verklärung zurücktritt und die mimetische Kraft seiner Darstellung, die satirische Prägnanz seines Blicks, sich am geschichtlichen Stoff der Wirklichkeit schärft" (145).[4] This philistine schoolteacher thus serves as a negative

example, and the satirical portrayal concretely and unmercifully reveals how political thought and behavior went so horribly wrong in the recent past.

The conclusion to this narrative makes Zacharias's weakness especially clear, when we see that his "loyal" wife is actually a harridan waiting to punish him for his carousing and that he grovels before her and eagerly extends his posterior to receive the expected blows from her feather-duster (167-70). He is revealed as a hypocrite of the type he condemns, since the reality of his marital hell has little in common with the lofty sentiments expressed in his speeches. The text thus offers a psychological explanation for his behavior, showing him to be a masochist filled with *ressentiment* , who compensates for his own inadequacies through dictatorial attempts to force others to submit to his thought and views.[5] But his attempts are all hollow and empty words: A. rarely agrees with him and tends to show more leadership throughout the story, since he is the one who suggests the tavern trip, orders the wine, and convinces Zacharias to partake of food when he has had too much to drink. School pupils and subordinates in the military would be the only ones susceptible to this individual's tyrannizing, yet one should not belittle the possible effects of such an attitude, since there was ample opportunity for people of this teacher's caliber to play their part in the destructiveness of Nazi Germany, especially when they were gathered en masse. In the portrait of Zacharias (and also of the servant Zerline in other parts of *Die Schuldlosen*), Durzak finds that Broch attains "eine künstlerische Eindringlichkeit, die in historische Repräsentanz umschlägt. Die in den Nationalsozialismus einmündende deutsche Situation wird hier transparent in der Mitläufermentalität des zwischen Großmannssucht und Unterwerfung schwankenden Zacharias" ("Zwischen Satire und Pathos" 146). Satire of an individual character gives a psycho-political analysis of a group in an actual historical situation, and it also serves as a warning.

The text thus explains how ordinary people, or at least a significant portion of them, could accept so perverse an ideology as Nazism, and it serves to instruct readers in avoiding a repetition. Or does it? As I stated at the outset, Broch had from his earliest philosophical studies been interested in the problem of cognition, the humane application of which might be

---

[4] Much of this same material is included in Durzak's *Hermann Broch: Dichtung und Erkenntnis* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1978) 198-202. Dominick LaCapra points out that in *Hofmannsthal und seine Zeit* Broch "looks to absolute satire as ethical art *par excellence*" (52) ["Broch As Cultural Historian," *Hermann Broch* , ed. Stephen D. Dowden, 42-53].

[5] Broch describes Zacharias in the essay "Probleme und Personen der 'Schuldlosen'": "Der Zwischenschicht halbproletarischen Mittelstandes entstammend, also spezifischer Spießer, geduckt von allem, was oben ist, dafür auf jeden trampelnd, der sich unter ihm befindet,ist er Repräsentant jener ganzen Zacharias-Rasse, die überall im gleichen Nebel von Opportunismus und Moralschlagworten lebt, Nebelmensch, dem alles gestattet ist, weil das Undurchdringliche ihm den Nebelmenschen verhüllt" (*Die Schuldlosen* 315).

able to redeem a cyclical history that would otherwise fail to progress (see also Schlant 27-29). And in other writings he indicates his belief that literature should have an ethical effect in providing *Läuterung* .[6] One would therefore expect "Die vier Reden des Studienrats Zacharias" to have a didactic function. To be sure, the narrator makes his political opinion clear and provides an analysis, but since neither the negatively portrayed Zacharias nor the positively depicted beekeeper can convince with monologic speeches, the narrator is forced to seek a different approach. And, as pointed out above, his use of satire is more effective than a straightforward presentation of opinion would have been. Yet even satire can convey a positive truth in negative form, and why should the reader accept the narrator's ironically presented views any more than he or she accepts Zacharias's remarks? Nazism was particularly dangerous because of its totalizing and totalitarian nature, and one of Zacharias's objections to the theory of relativity was the latter's intrusion into the closed corpus of knowledge with which he could maintain superiority over his students. If an author possessess an outlook which is then offered in a narrative as closed-off content that is supposed to be accepted by the reader, is that author not guilty of imposing a crypto-Fascist totality in the very manner that is being criticized? Broch seems particularly susceptible to this danger, since he held idealistic, Platonic views and wrote in the "Entstehungsbericht" to *Die Schuldlosen* that it was up to the novel to offer the totalities that science could no longer provide.[7] Yet he is also aware of the evilness of closed systems that take themselves as end products, rather than as paths to an open goal (see Schlant 119 and 126-27). If the main character is a teacher who fails because of his adherence to such a closed system, how can a

---

[6] See for example his remarks in the essay "Inhalt und Darstellungsmethode der 'Schuldlosen'" (*Die Schuldlosen* 301-18, esp. 307). Schlant also quotes one of the reasons he gives for choosing literature *(Dichtung)* over other fields: "the immediate ethical impact. . . . Ethical effectiveness is to a large extent due to enlightenment; and for such activities the work of literature is a far better means than science" (39) [from Hermann Broch, *Gesammelte Werke* 9 (Zürich: Rhein Verlag, 1953-61, 10 vols.) 45-46].

[7] "Entstehungsbericht" 324. Michael Winkler summarizes in his review of Karl Menges, *Kritische Studien zur Wertphilosophie Hermann Brochs* (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1970), Menges's conclusion that "especially in his political theory, Broch portrays a crypto-fascistic pattern of argumentation" ("The Wanderer in Search of a System: A Review of Recent Publications Concerning Hermann Broch," *GQ* 48 [1975]: 239). Dowden also finds Broch's fascination with myth and totality a cause for uneasiness, though he concludes that Broch's "fascination with totality" does not mean that he sympathized with the political right ("Literature, Philosophy, Politics," *Hermann Broch* 8). In another essay he writes: "Broch's writing is strongest and most persuasive precisely where his fiction succeeds in artfully illuminating, however briefly and modestly, a minute, fragmented piece of lived experience. At such junctures he fulfills most effectively the ethically founded *Erkenntnisfunktion* that he attributes to literature. At such moments, Broch's writing breaks with his own injunction to *Ganzheit* and *Totalitätserfassung* : where Broch aims at the whole, he is nearest to kitsch; where he deals with the particular he is at his most trenchant" ("Ornament, Totality, Kitsch and *The Sleepwalkers* ," *Hermann Broch* 278).

text about such a teacher succeed in providing instruction?[8]

Broch himself was skeptical of the ability of literature to have an ethical effect, even though he worked toward that end. He writes in the "Entstehungsbericht":

> Noch nie hat ein Kunstwerk irgend jemanden zu irgend etwas "bekehrt." Das bürgerliche Publikum war von den "Webern," war von den Brechtschen Stücken begeistert, ist aber darum nicht sozialistisch geworden. . . . Es ist immer nur der Autor, der seine Überzeugung ausspricht, doch die Erschütterung, die er damit auslöst, bleibt im ästhetischen Bereich; bloß der bereits überzeugte wird überzeugt.[9]

Even though he thought that the ethical remained subordinate to the aesthetic in the work of art, the content of the message is not sufficient to bring a reader to ethical cognition. It is only through the mediation of content by a particular form that a text might lead to new awareness. Therefore, in order to answer the questions raised above about the text's ability to teach without itself succumbing to the faults of the teaching that is being criticized, it is necessary to look at the form of the text, rather than at the content alone.

The form of "Die vier Reden des Studienrats Zacharias" displays a number of features that work to provide something more than a simple acceptance of the tale's message as the answer. Narratives aiming for unity and cohesion were more characteristic of the nineteenth century than of the modern era, and Broch would have found such an approach an inadequate anachronism for dealing with contemporary phenomena. In an essay describing the technique of James Joyce's *Ulysses* , a work he greatly admired, Broch drew a parallel to the theory of relativity, which is itself treated thematically in "Die vier Reden." He realized that "an ideal observer and an ideal act of observation must be included in the field of observation" and "that one cannot simply place an object under a lightbeam and describe it, but that the subject of the representation, hence the 'narrator as idea,' and no less language, with which the object of representation is described, are part of the means of representation."[10] Schlant says that the "'narrator as idea' is present in any device which draws attention to the fact that the novel is a deliberate, 'scientific' construct, expressing not only narrative content of stylistic and technical limitations as well as those of perspective." She finds that the narrator as idea is Broch's chief contribution to the theory of the novel (51).

---

[8] Schlant, for example, is not altogether convinced by the analysis that Broch offers: "Broch establishes a close correlation between ideological affiliation and sexual practices which is consistent with the accepted Nazi stereotype but seems too facile in the context of the novel" (127). It is therefore necessary to search beyond the satirical target for a more valid didactic message.

[9] "Entstehungsbericht" 326-27. See also Durzak, *Hermann Broch: Dichtung und Erkenntnis* 186.

[10] From *Gesammelte Werke* 6: 197 (qtd. in Schlant 51).

80

This technique is especially obvious in "Methodisch konstruiert," the first of the narratives in which Zacharias appears. There the contours of his character emerge as the hypothetical fulfillment of an abstract category, and one possible ending is suggested, only to be rejected and replaced by another. But "Die vier Reden" also makes use of the narrator as idea, although to a lesser extent. The irony with which the narrator presents the external and internal facets of the teacher's character creates a gap between two possible constructions of the meaning of a group of words. His recording of a thought that the teacher takes seriously indicates his own opinion of its ridiculousness: "Wie konnte man seinen Lehrberuf ausüben, wenn man gezwungen werden sollte, unaufhörlich neuen Stoff zuzulernen?" (142). But the presence of two opinions is not in itself sufficient to stimulate the reader to thought; in fact, it could encourage the rejection of Zacharias's outlook in favor of the superior perception of the ironist. While this may be more desirable than the opposite choice, it would be the result of a certain amount of manipulation (through a caricature of the opponent's position) and would continue to reinforce the notion that the narrator is in possession of a total truth. Broch's historical problem in searching for an adequate narrative method lies in the inability to supply a total truth with a seamless novel about an ideology that was so destructive, largely as a result of its totalitarian attempts to enforce its own notion of truth.

Thus there are other aspects of the form of this text that work against the unquestioned acceptance of an encapsulated message. One example would be the narrator's admission of his own lack of knowledge. When the drunken pair reaches Zacharias's apartment, several possible reasons are given for the teacher's attitude: "Ob zum Beweis seiner Hilfsbedürftigkeit gespielt, oder ob in seiner Steigfähigkeit vielleicht wirklich durch den Alkoholgenuß beeinträchtigt, ob so oder so, je höher Zacharias die knarrende, quietschende Holztreppe hinaufkam, desto langsamer ging es . . ." (167). Another obvious formal feature is the fragmentary construction of the novel as a whole, as well as of this part.[11] The "Elf Erzählungen" that compose *Die Schuldlosen* are divided into three groups, which take place in 1913, 1923, and 1933, respectively. The main characters appear in isolated episodes, and although there is some continuity, not all of them come into contact with one another or appear in a consistently developing plot. A. in fact is the only character from the other parts of the novel with whom Zacharias converses. What links these figures is the fact

[11] Durzak sees little connection between many of the parts and questions the unity of the novel as a whole (*Hermann Broch: Dichtung und Erkenntnis* 183-84). Michael Winkler, however, says that there is purpose behind the seeming incompleteness. He thinks that Broch wanted to solve a problem poetically, i.e., "daß Broch sein gewissermaßen testamentarisches Werk als eine Art Gesamtabrechnung mit seiner Epoche und seiner eigenen Existenz als Denker und Dichter verstand." In Winkler's opinion the form thus does not result from a chance bungling, but from Broch's own rules of creativity that produced a multidimensional narrative work of art ("Brochs Roman" 184).

that they are "*schuldlos*," or innocent of what was to occur after 1933. The title is ironic of course, since even though the characters are technically and legally innocent of any crime, they are actually "schuldlos schuldhaft" in an ethical sense.[12] Not all have the same psychopathological traits as Zacharias, and his case must be taken in context with the others. He demonstrates only one of the reasons for the success of Nazism, not the sole one: the analysis presented in "Die vier Reden" does not represent an entire explanation. A.'s retention of an initial rather than a name and his juxtaposition with Zacharias prompt the teacher to say, "Alle Namen von A bis Z" (154): this remark further indicates the characters as possible concrete fulfillments of abstract ideas and implies that there are many more than two positions. The narrative of "Die vier Reden" is in itself fragmented: in addition to the narrator's ironically descriptive introduction, there are the conversations with A., the monologic speeches of Zacharias, and the episode at the end with Zacharias's wife. A reader must take all of these into account, not just the opinion of the narrator, even though that opinion comes through so clearly. And the reader must supply linkages that are not always explicitly drawn.

A., who serves as a foil for Zacharias, seems at first to represent a positive counterpart to this proto-Nazi because he frequently disagrees with the teacher's sentiments and mannerisms, but he cannot be taken as a model for emulation either. He finds Zacharias's company interesting enough to continue it through four bottles of wine, to join in the toast to their brotherhood, and to link himself in ridicule to his new brother as they each wear half a hat on the drunken trek home. He is more perceptive than Zacharias and refrains from embracing the latter's questionable ideas, but he at best represents a position of detached amusement. In fact, subsequent narratives within the novel make even more explicit his withdrawal from action and inability to face responsibility. Durzak, for example, says that A. embodies phlegmatic, middle-class fatalism ("Zwischen Satire und Pathos" 147). "Die vier Reden" concludes with A.'s walk to his own abode, after having departed from the hell that Zacharias shares with his wife. In these paragraphs the narrator follows A. and makes generalizations about Germany that are, once again, not entirely convincing because of their directness: "Vernünftiger und bedächtiger als anderswo geht es in Deutschland zu, trotzdem triebverfallener und gieriger und höllischer als anderswo," or "dem Deutschen fällt der Humor schwer" (171). These remarks lack the irony with which Zacharias's observations about his nation are to be understood, and are difficult to take at face value, even when the reader might already agree with them.

"Unwahrheit hie, Unwahrheit da, und unendlich schmal dazwischen ist der Wahrheitspfad, der Pfad zwischen zwei Welten, dem deutschen Menschen zwar vorgezeichnet, aber . . . offenbar nicht begehbar," says the text (171). Germans of

[12] Broch discusses this "schuldlose Schuldhaftigkeit" in more detail in the "Entstehungsbericht" (325).

Zacharias's type failed in their search for the path to truth, since simply marking it is not sufficient. This text has marked it for the reader, who, however, cannot simply adopt either the textual version of truth or the path to it in toto. Written in German for Germans, this text implies that the path it charts probably cannot be followed. The path represents a process, which the reader must learn and complete for himself. A. sees the shortcomings of Zacharias's behavior and thought, yet he simply refrains from pursuing the matter or drawing the consequences, and thus he too is a failure. The final paragraph asks why the path to virtue is a way of frightful torture, and then continues: "A. wußte keine Antwort. Was ging's ihn schließlich auch an? Er brauchte sich darum nicht zu kümmern. Er war zu Hause angelangt und ging sofort zu Bett; er hatte sich's verdient" (172). His taking of the easy way out stands as a challenge to the reader, who should presumably act in a different manner. The ending is thus left open as it approaches a final message. The reader too has the opportunity to dismiss the problem as being of no concern, but neither this course of action, nor the adoption of Zacharias's views, nor the unquestioned acceptance of the narrator's position represents the proper choice. The formal elements that open up the text refrain from copying a Fascist method that presumes to impose the teaching of a total truth. Instead, the text demonstrates a more democratic respect for the reader by conveying the complexities of the situation so that real learning might begin.[13] The lack of a single, clearly stated message within the text and the seeming lack of unity between this narrative and its companions in *Die Schuldlosen* result from necessary formal constraints: failing to observe them would have resulted in an imbalance between the aesthetic and the ethical. By returning to literature in the late 1940s and by joining later texts to earlier ones Broch combines foresight with hindsight and, having learned from the failings of his attempts to become effective though political and philosophical essays, cautiously reaffirms the power of fictional narrative to provide insight. In its depiction of a failed teacher, "Die vier Reden des Studienrats Zacharias" succeeds in teaching by its formal revelation of the inadequacies of all attempts to state a total truth directly.

CALVIN N. JONES

DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES
UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH ALABAMA
MOBILE

[13] Judith Ryan points out the importance of the reader for Broch in *Die Verzauberung* : since this novel departs from straightforward realism, it has to be evaluated by the reader. Although the realist novel is too close to authoritarianism, according to Ryan, the modernist novel is too easily misread to provide an answer to Fascism. She finds that *Die Verzauberung* is weakened by ambiguities that cause the reader to accept the character of Mother Gisson too easily as a positive figure ("The Self-destructing Message: A Response to Paul Michael Lützeler," *Hermann Broch* , ed. Stephen D. Dowden, 38-40).

TWO GURUS - VONNEGUT'S BOKONON AND NARAYAN'S RAJU: TEACHERS OUTSIDE THE CLASSROOM

A guru, Lama Govinda tells us, "is far more than a teacher in an ordinary sense of the word. A teacher gives knowledge, but a Guru gives himself. The real teachings . . . are what remain unspoken. . . . The Guru is an *inspirer* "[1] As such, the guru neither seeks to manipulate the affairs of men nor to enlist disciples, as either course would place him crossgrained with the universe. Instead he sinks into himself until his being harmonizes with the universe. An analysis of two fictional gurus, Kurt Vonnegut's Bokonon, founder of the religion of Bokononism in *Cat's Cradle*, [2] and R.K. Narayan's Raju, the reluctant holy man who passes from tourist guide to spiritual guide in *The Guide*, [3] provides insights into the essential nature of the guru.

Both Vonnegut and Narayan are expert at depicting the comedic nature of the human condition, seeing through man's pitiful efforts to comprehend the nature of the divine with the inadequate tool of simple causality. Each makes extensive use of paradox and each creates a worldly holy man, a teacher, through whom he illustrates his views of religion and education. There they part company, perhaps the reason that they have not previously been the subjects of combined analysis.

Vonnegut's bitter satire comes from the point of view of Western man, whose reason and attempts to master nature have brought the world to the brink of annihilation. Bokonon prepares to die, thumbing his nose at You Know Who. Narayan's gentle world view is that of the Hindu: the acceptance of man's lot and destiny. Both world views are illustrated through the characters of the gurus. Raju begins as a tourist guide and ends an authentic Holy Man. Falling obsessively in love with a dancer, he exploits her and everyone else who cares about him until he becomes a wealthy man and eventually lands in prison. Bokonon, too, begins as a manipulator, a rich black LBJ. Born Lionel Boyd Johnson, an Episcopally educated young carouser with his eye on sainthood, he becomes a sailor, studies at the London School of Economics and Political Science, fights in WW I, is gassed, then, after his recovery, is torpedoed and twice more shipwrecked. Developing a conviction that he has a destiny, he sails all over the world, becomes a disciple of Gandhi, is imprisoned for pro- testing against the Raj, and, after his release, builds himself another boat and sets sail with McCabe, AWOL from the Marines. Stealing some recreation fund money, they put to sea. Shipwrecked and naked they are washed ashore on the inauspicious island of San Lorenzo.

Johnson, like Raju, is in essence reborn as a guru, Johnson dumped naked on a beach after the shipwreck and Raju thrust penniless out of prison where he had found considerable peace tending his garden. Johnson becomes Bokonon, this being the native pronunciation of Johnson. Seeing the poverty of the people, people so poor that all they own is their diseases, they decide to

[1] Lama Anagarika Govinda, *The Way of the White Clouds: A Buddhist Pilgrim in Tibet* (Berkeley: Shambhala, 1971) 26.

[2] Kurt Vonnegut, *Cat's Cradle* (New York: Delacorte, 1963).

[3] R. K. Narayan, *The Guide* (New York: Viking, 1958).

make San Lorenzo a Utopia. McCabe and Johnson have, after all, "the glistening treasure of literacy, ambition, curiosity, gall, irreverence, health, humor, and considerable information about the outside world" (106). They represent the brag, brawn, and know-how of the West.

On the other hand, Raju, sitting on the steps of an unused temple wondering what to do and where to go after his release from prison, falls into the role of Guide when Velan, a natural disciple, comes along. Velan immediately sees Raju as a holy man and begins to ask his advice. Raju, typical of the East and unlike Bokonon, makes no effort to begin to start a new religion or even to exploit an old one. He attempts to convince Velan that he is not a holy man by telling him his life story. Although the story is sordid, Raju is not ashamed and after a lifetime of deception presents himself truthfully. Velan is unimpressed by the truth although impressed that Raju has told him the story. When he asks advice, Raju obliges, "the old habit of asserting guidance to others asserting itself" (6).

Bokonon has no use for truth. Believing it too horrible for the people to face, he creates Bokononism, a religion based on lies and has it outlawed because, according to the Calypso, he believes

> That a really good religion
> Is a form of treason (143)

He also invents the hook on which those caught practicing Bokononism would be skewered and dangled until their death. "And Bokonon went into cozy hiding in the jungle. . . where he wrote and preached all day long and ate good things his disciples brought him" (ibid.). Of course, McCabe would instigate unsuccessful hunts for the Holy Man.

Raju, too, lives on the food that his disciples bring. He continues to offer offhanded wisdom that works, and no matter how he tries to dissuade Velan, who serves the function of a *chela* (one who establishes a profound relationship with the guru[4]), everything he does serves only to reinforce Velan's conviction, and ours, that he is truly a holy man. Raju begins to dispense advice based on what he has learned from his mother and from his life experience.

Surprising himself each time he makes a profound pronouncement, "Raju felt he was growing wings. Shortly. . . he might. . . float in the air and perch himself on the tower of the ancient temple. . . . He suddenly found himself asking, 'Have I been in prison or in some sort of transmigration?'" (19). The answer is, of course, both. Karma has carried him where he was meant to go.

Although life is still hideous for both the disciples of Raju and the San Lorenzans, it is made less so for each group by the guru, but with a difference. In San Lorenzo:

> . . . people didn't have to pay as much attention to the awful truth. As the living legend of the cruel tyrant in the city and the gentle holy man in the jungle grew, so, too, did the happiness of the people grow. They were all

[4] Govinda 27.

> employed full time as actors in a play they understood, that any human being anywhere could understand and applaud. (144)

In other words life becomes a work of art, as Bokonon has cynically created a religion. The narrator warns, "Anyone unable to understand how a useful religion can be founded on lies will not understand this book either" (16). "The drama, we find, was very tough on the souls of the two main actors" (144), each of whom had been half devil and half saint. It "demanded that the pirate half of Bokonon and the angel half of McCabe wither away. And McCabe and Bokonon pay a terrible price in agony for the happiness of the people — McCabe knowing the agony of the tyrant and Bokonon knowing the agony of the saint" (144-45). He does not, as Stanley Schatt argues, go insane.[5]

Bokonon feeds the people well-meant lies. Raju, however, accepting fate, yet not understanding it, remains at the temple while people bring him food and seek his wisdom. A drought has reduced them to desperate circumstances. Through a misunderstanding, word gets out among the faithful that Raju will fast to end the drought. Although this is the farthest thing from his mind, he begins by pretending to fast so as not to disappoint the people and ends by truly fasting, becoming the true holy man and releasing them from the drought.

Both gurus have, as we have seen, been extremely worldly men, and each has loved a goddess-like young woman, symbolic of her culture. Mona of San Lorenzo is the world's most beautiful woman, the island's national treasure and a xylophonist. Bokonon says that "Mona has the simplicity of the all" (119). Like an ancient Greek goddess, she is dressed in a white toga, her hips a lyre. She plays *When Day Is Done* on her xylophone (ibid). Raju's Rosie, a classical Indian dancer, is beautiful, incredibly talented, and has been a village temple dancer (73). Her dances depict classical Indian mythology. As Rothfork tells us, "Rosie symbolizes the living heritage of India which is experienced, not merely studied."[6] Each woman sets about to retain order. Mona, however, when she sees the havoc wrought by ice-nine, which instantly turns into ice everything containing water that it comes in contact with, touches her lips with a crystal of the substance and dies. Rosie, her life in shambles, keeps on dancing, pays Raju's debts although she has no desire to retain contact with him, and gains even greater fame than she had under him. With Mona's death, we see the West flicker out, taking with it the Third World. Rosie continues dancing, however, dancing the survival of mother India, perhaps of the Third World.

Bokonon illustrates the West's lack of acceptance. He deliberately sets out to become a holy man. Recognizing the paradoxical nature of truth, he creates a religion based on lies. His calypso goes: "I wanted all things/ To seem to make some sense,/ So we could all be happy yes, instead of tense,/ And I made up lies/ So that they all fit nice,/ And I made this sad world/ Par-a-dise" (90).

---

5 Stanley Schatt, *Kurt Vonnegut, Jr.* (Boston: Twayne, 1976) 66. Schatt misses the paradoxical point when he avers that Bokonon, because he was forced to live a lie, went insane, and, obsessed with the paradoxical nature of truth, destroyed his followers.

6 John Rothfork, "Hindu Mysticism in the Twentieth Century: R. K. Narayan's *The Guide*," *PQ* 62.1 (1983): 33. This essay removes any doubts that Narayan intended to create a real holy man.

"Paradise" is, of course, a play on "pair of dice." Bokonon always said that he would never follow his own teachings because he knew that they were no good. When the massed population of San Lorenzo survivors, in a prelude to the Jim Jones massacre, demanded that he tell them what God was up to, he said that God had finished with them and they should have the good manners to die. Which they did (220). As Mona laughingly asks when surveying the frozen corpses, "Would you wish any of these alive again, if you could?" (221).

Raju in contrast knows the value of his wisdom. Once people had made him their spiritual guide, he "was surprised at the amount of wisdom welling from the depths of his being." He realizes "that we generally do not have a correct measure of our own wisdom" (40). Reflecting on his education, he realizes that much of it came from talking to people when he was a shop keeper and tourist guide. In addition, he had read everything he could get his hands on: "I read stuff that interested me, bored me, baffled me. . . . I read stuff that pushed up a noble thought . . . . I gazed on pictures of old temples and battleships, of new temples and ruins and new buildings and battleships, and soldiers, and pretty girls around whom my thoughts lingered. I learned much from scrap" (42).

He has learned enough to become authentic. After a scuffle in which he attempts to keep people from touching his feet, "Because no human being should ever prostrate before another human being," Velan tells him, "Your penance is similar to Mahatma Gandhi's. He has left us a disciple in you to save us" (92-93).

No gentle disciple, Bokonon prepares defiantly to end "grinning horribly, and thumbing my nose at You Know Who" (231). Nadeau sees the God at Whom Bokonon wishes to thumb his nose as just another "foma" or illusion (126).[7] While this may well be, Bokonon has waged war against this illusion and lost. The nose-thumbing is his pitiful and ultimately ineffectual act of defiance. He experiences neither Ahab's monumental rage, nor Raju's transcendent acceptance, but merely puny anger. *Cat's Cradle* is satiric, viciously funny, true, and very Western. Ultimately it teaches that there is neither a cradle nor a cat.

Raju, as we have seen, never set out to do good, yet when the time came he accepted his destiny and became a true holy man, his sufferings and death breaking the drought and bringing the rains necessary for the survival of the people. The scene surrounding his last days is carnival-like, people coming "like swarms of ants converging on a lump of sugar," the air ringing with music, an assertion of life (215). Bokonon remains forever outside nature, as ultimately manipulative as the scientists who created ice-nine. Unable to let understanding stop at what cannot be understood, Raju saves both his people and himself. Illuminated by a great shaft of light, so weak that he has to be held as a baby, he feels the rain in the hills rising in his feet and legs before he dies. He is escorted to the dry river where he prays, finally saying to Velan, " . . . it's raining in the hills. I can feel it coming up under my feet, up my legs' - . . .and sagged down" (220). Here is complete union (ibid). As Rothfork says, "He returns to the mother earth, dissolving into the embryonic water, and thus back into the river of life itself. Even more than Nalini [Rosie], the Swami is absorbed in the dance of being, the energy of life" (40).

[7] Robert Nadeau, *Readings from the New Book of Nature: Physics and Metaphysics in the Modern Novel* (Amherst: U of Mass. P, 1981) 121-33.

While Nadeau may be correct in assuming that Vonnegut's moral is the interrelatedness of all things (127), an Eastern as well as a scientific precept, it seems clear that Bokonon never dances the dance of being because it is a dance that can neither be learned nor taught. Raju, as Rothfork explains, does not initiate his own movements, "He simply follows predetermined movements. In other words, he dances. In the dance he loses his own ego identity and is absorbed in a mystical rapport with Shiva-Nataraja" (40). He becomes a divine dancer. Yeats's lines in "Among School Children" may serve as illumination:

> Are you the leaf, the blossom or the bole?
> O body swayed to music, O brightening glance,
> How can we know the dancer from the dance?

We cannot know the dancer from the dance because they are one. Bokonon, attempting to find the cat in the cradle, stands outside the dance. Unable to accept suffering as part of the pattern, he leads his followers to suicide. Raju, never intending to become a teacher, brings the water of life to those he leads, ending as a true guru, an inspirer.

FELICIA CAMPBELL

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH
UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA, LAS VEGAS

GAIL GODWIN'S PARALYZING PLOTS AND THE WOMAN PROFESSOR

From her second novel, *Glass People* (1972), to her latest, *A Southern Family* (1987), Gail Godwin has written self-reflexive fiction. To varying degrees and toward a variety of ends, her novels often echo, revise, and parody other texts. In both *The Odd Woman* (1974) and *Violet Clay* (1978), serious satiric novels about the plights of the female professor and the female artist, this self-reflexiveness serves as a means of questioning the relation of women to the dominant literary tradition. Godwin's many structural and thematic allusions to other texts and literary traditions in these earlier novels are a means of subverting the power such a tradition holds over her characters, her readers, and her culture.

The Odd Woman is wholly intertextual as well as self-reflexive. Its form emerges from tales within tales, and it becomes a novel about fiction as well as about its own plot.Godwin effects a perpetual blur, as did Joyce in both *Ulysses* and *Finnegans Wake*, between her own text and a great many others; but her main purpose in using these embedded narratives, unlike that of Joyce, is not to evoke the mythic aspects of texts and the cyclical dimensions of experience.[1] *The Odd Woman* was published, as Rachel Brownstein has noted, at a time when questioning the depiction of women in the male literary tradition was a highly visible and marketable enterprise in both academic and popular presses.[2] Because of its self-reflexiveness and intertextuality, this novel can, therefore, be read as both an allegory and a parody of those feminist interrogations of male literature. *The Odd Woman* is a feminist critique, albeit a qualified one, of woman's alterior relation to the English literary canon. Jane's quest is not solely for a life more vital and immediate than the one she has lived as a teacher of English, ensconced in one room or another reading student papers or preparing lectures. It is also a search for a story of her own, for a hitherto unwritten plot that would free her from the paralyzing narratives - both male- and female-authored Victorian texts that

[1] Nor is her main purpose, as Susan Lorsch has suggested, to satirize the academic's immersion in literature and consequent removal from life. Although Lorsch has also commented that "the novel's focus on fiction's traditional portrayal of women and its effect on women's relations with and reactions to men" is "of special interest," she does not elaborate on this theme. Rather, she sees *The Odd Woman* as Godwin's "convincing quarrel with the literary imagination" and focuses on the ways in which literature "conditions [Jane's] very mode of seeing" ("Gail Godwin's *The Odd Woman* : Literature and the Retreat from Life," *Critique* 20 [1978]: 21, 32).

[2] In "*The Odd Woman* and Literary Feminism," *American Women Writing Fiction: Memory, Identity, Family, Space*, ed. Mickey Pearlman (Lexington: UP of Kentucky, 1989), Brownstein comments that "the thoroughgoing literariness of its protagonist is a clue to *The Odd Woman* 's historical moment. In the mid-seventies real and fictional women like Jane Clifford were fascinating to themselves and to others as never before - or perhaps since" (175).

romanticize female victimization and passivity[3] - which she reads, teaches, and lives. This paper will focus on Jane Clifford's struggle to move beyond her obsession with literary analogues. It will also examine the intertextual strategies through which Godwin subverts romantic tradition in this novel.

Godwin's most obvious allusion to a Victorian text is in her title. *The Odd Woman* is a direct reference to George Gissing's 1890 novel *The Odd Women* . In Victorian usage the word "odd" meant single, or alone, like Jane herself, and it is a state Jane alternately bemoans and embraces throughout the novel. She chooses to teach *The Odd Women* during her second-semester course on "Women in Literature," and as a result she reads and thinks about that novel throughout the narrative:

> She had chosen Gissing for an opener because of his unrelenting pessimism. It was one of the few nineteenth-century novels she could think of in which every main female character who was allowed to live through the last page had to do so alone. The book's ending depressed her utterly, and she was eager to fling it into a classroom of young women (and men?) who still believed they could get everything and see how they would deal with Gissing's assurance that they would not.[4]

Jane is presumbly teaching Gissing's text as a didactic novel to her female students, but it also resonates in her own emotional and social life. As Jane takes notes on the novel, awaiting her lover's return to their Manhattan hotel room, she charts the bleak fates of the novel's five odd women: Monica Madden, after "engaging in a disastrous flirtation with a 'rogue,'" dies giving birth to her husband's daughter; Virginia Madden, a severe alcoholic, hopes to become a "useful member to society" by helping her sister open a school for young children; Alice Madden "starts all over again in a child" as she raises her sister's baby; Mary Barfoot, of "menopausal age," gives up wanting things for herself and finds "fulfillment through others" in her work with young women; and finally, Rhoda Nunn, after a ruinous love affair, begins a feminist newspaper, "sublimating her personal desires and furies into a 'cause'" (292).

Many of the female characters in Godwin's novel are modern doubles of Gissing's Victorian women. Godwin as narrator therefore allows the reader to apprehend her own text as

---

[3] Helena Michie has noted that "Gail Godwin's novels are sometimes rewritings of the lives and works of the Victorians; her *Odd Woman* is only one case in point." See *The Flesh Made Word* (New York & London: Oxford UP, 1987) 131.

[4] Gail Godwin, *The Odd Woman* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1974) 27. Subsequent references to this edition will appear in the text.

both an analogue to Gissing's and an ironic, indicting retelling of sundry romances and tales. Author, character, and reader become involved in the mutual task of acknowledging and imaginatively subverting the plots that have doomed women to deaths-in-marriage, untimely ends, or uneasy compromises. But unlike Gissing's text, a made and complete artifact, a narrative informed as much by the Victorian's new-found knowledge of Darwinism as by Gissing's misogyny, Jane's life is still making itself. What she is searching for, despite her reliance on the traditional figures and genres, is "a metaphor of her own" (3). On the morning of her grandmother's death, soon after the narrative begins, Jane perceives her life as an open book, an unwritten plot. She feels a moment of "passionate giddy hope," in which she realizes that she "had not written herself into any premature endings. False middles, perhaps, but there was time. . ." (44). Jane's desire to rewrite her own history and future parallels the role of Godwin's novel in literary history; both are self-conscious and ironically hopeful revisions of texts.

Another Victorian text embedded in *The Odd Woman* is *Jane Eyre*. Jane Clifford's plight vaguely and ironically echoes that of Charlotte Brontë's Jane Eyre. Godwin's Jane, like Brontë's, is a teacher in love with a married man, another academic named Gabriel Weeks. Although Jane Clifford attempts to find sustenance in their limited time together and to resist the temptation to imagine herself as Gabriel's wife, she, like her predecessor in Brontë's novel, is haunted by images of her lover's wife, Ann Weeks. Unlike Bertha Mason, however, Ann does not emerge as a hirsute and mad counterpart to Jane. Instead she is depicted as a placid suburban housewife whom Jane imagines meeting in the supermarket. Such an encounter plays ironically on the gothic drama of Brontë's text as well as on the metaphors of food Gabriel uses to describe the two women in his life; he could never choose, could never pick one over the other, because they are as different as "apples and oranges." Yet Gabriel is no Rochester. As his angelic name implies, he is as otherworldly and vague as Rochester is earthy and forceful. Moreover, despite its satisfying divergences, Jane Eyre's story concludes with the convention of comic romance - "Reader, I married him" - while Jane Clifford ends her relationship with Gabriel with the ironically funny and anticlimactic written address: "I decided to leave."[5]

The Pre-Raphaelites are known both for their intramarital entanglements and their paradoxical portrayal of women as both ideal and sexual figures.[6] Godwin plays on this

[5] Annis Pratt distinguishes the anti-romantic visions of Godwin, Joyce Carol Oates, and Doris Lessing from that of the contemporary novelist Margaret Drabble. The former, she concludes, "portray romantic love and personal self-sufficiency as incompatible" (*Archetypal Patterns in Women's Fiction* [Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1981] 119).

[6] For a discussion of Rossetti and his role in the Pre-Raphaelite movement, the ideology of womanhood the Pre-Raphaelites created and sustained through their art, and the various infidelities within the group, see Brian

irony with her description of the relationship between Jane and Gabriel. Just as Pre-Raphaelite art was a curious fusion of medieval and mythical imagery with sexually charged realistic iconography, so Jane and Gabriel's relationship is ostensibly spiritual and intellectual but actually and primarily sexual. As a contemporary woman, Jane defends her right to remain Gabriel's mistress, but the relationship seems to exist solely on Gabriel's conditions and in response to his needs. They see one another removed from their homes and from the daily rhythms of their lives. Even when they are together their conversations are abstract and without substance. Gabriel suggests that he meet Jane in New York, yet he spends much of his time in museums and at dinner with friends.

Like Gabriel Rossetti and Jane Morris, the Godwin protagonist and lover embody a transcendent ideal rather than the actual coming together of two people who know and care about one another. Jane allows herself, for a time, to exist as an object of Gabriel's imagination. Lounging about in one hotel room after another, Jane appears like the sensual but transcendent images of womanhood that Rossetti suggested in many of his paintings of Jane Morris, such as *Astarte Syriaca* and *Day Dream* . Yet these are passive images of womanhood painted through the imaginative vision of men who transform the ordinary into the sublime. They are embodiments of women trapped in the male gaze just as Jane is trapped in Gabriel's ethereal vision of their relationship; she is afraid to bring it down to earth by asking inappropriate questions about Gabriel's wife or about when they might see each other again. Jane's relationship with Gabriel becomes yet another instance in which she allows herself to become mythologized and permits her life to take on the attractive but uncomfortable dimensions of literature. As she had done in her refusal to remain Gabriel's waiting Jane Eyre, she removes herself finally from the procrustean bed of the Ideal Beloved to seek out her own visions and plots.

Still other allusions to nineteenth-century literature fill the pages of *The Odd Woman* . Jane perceives her own mother's life as an example of aborted romance, a tragic love story turned depressingly pedestrian. Kitty's past is replete with the conventions of both classic and popular romance. She was widowed during World War II and left with a young daughter to raise, then missed marrying her soul's companion owing to a series of accidents. When she eventually remarried after the war it was to a younger man, an ex-GI from a Romantic Poetry class she was teaching at the local college. He proposed to her at the end of his exam by writing, "I have met my Belle Dame Sans Merci" (9). Although she corresponds with her old lover while they are both married, hoping some day to consummate the relationship, other events intervene to prevent their long-anticipated reunion. Now, Kitty teaches at a Catholic girls' school and accepts the quiet compensations of her once passionate marriage to Ray Sparks. In the context of Godwin's allusion to *The Odd Women* , Kitty is a Mary Barfoot

and Judy Dobbs, *Dante Gabriel Rossetti: An Alien Victorian* (London: McDonald and Jane's, 1977).

figure, a menopausal woman who finds fulfillment through others.

Essential to our reading of Godwin's text is an understanding of how Jane perceives and responds to her mother, and to the other women of the novel, in relation to her own literary illusions. Despite Jane's sophistication, as a teacher and a woman she is initially hungry for proof that the romantic formula does exist in the world. Jane revels in the details of her colleague Sonia Mark's passionate affair with another English professor, after which they divorce their spouses messily to marry one another. Yet she accepts with reluctance her mother's passage from the illusory world of romantic love into a middle-aged resignation to marriage and teaching. As they are packing Edith's personal possessions after the funeral, Jane confronts her mother: "I want to know whether there has ever existed in the world a lasting, lively love in which a man and woman exist, for years and years and years, taking sustenance and delight from this love rather than in spite of it. . . . I don't see much evidence of it, but I am collecting evidence. Look at George Eliot and Lewes. They completed each other" (167). When Kitty and Jane find an old diary of Kitty's hidden away in one of Edith's drawers, Jane is again eager for secrets of Kitty's past, for information that will convince her that her mother was once, still might be, a passionate, yearning woman, and that such a life might still become her own. Sonia has continued to provide Jane with indications that her new marriage is fiery and alive, but Kitty guards the diary protectively, eventually flushing its pages down the toilet. Her message to Jane is clear: this is my text, these were my words and thoughts and feelings. I am much changed from the young woman I once was; I no longer need or want such passion. But if these are the stories you are searching for, you must write your own diary, author your own life.[7]

Such existential freedom is difficult for Jane, given the authority of a literary tradition she perceives as both seductive and destructive. And to complicate Jane's ambivalent relation to literary tradition, her own family members have been prolific myth-makers. Jane finds her Aunt Cleva's melodramatic fate as compelling as the romantic plots she imagines hidden in her mother's past and existing in Sonia's revival of Eliot and Lewes. Edith used Cleva's story to keep both the young Kitty and Jane in check when her own inner resources were not strong enough to control the adolescent impulses of her daughter and granddaughter. Just as Kitty relays her past using the conventions of the star-crossed romance, Edith narrates the fate of Cleva with the ballad-like melodrama of oral history: Cleva ran away with a man and died

[7] In "Gail Godwin and Southern Womanhood," Carolyn Rhodes sees the relationship between Kitty, Jane, and Edith as enmeshed in a different tradition - the cult of the southern lady. She comments that "as Kitty compares herself with her mother, so does Jane measure herself by contrast with both her mother and grandmother. Jane sometimes wishes she could learn the social deftness of her forebears, and she admires the serenity of their accepted roles. Yet she can feel only disdain for many mannerisms of typical Southern women" (*Women Writers of the Contemporary South* , ed. Peggy Whitman Prenshaw [Jackson: UP of Mississippi, 1984] 59).

before she could return home, but left behind an infant born in shame.

Also like Kitty's second marriage, beginning as it did with an allusion to Keats's "La Belle Dame Sans Merci," Cleva's disastrous romance parallels the events of the play at which she met her lover. She encountered her own villain in 1905 after watching a performance of *The Fatal Wedding*. He was one of the actors in the production, and she ran off with him immediately afterward. The family based its conclusions about the identity of Cleva's paramour solely on a message she had scribbled on the playbill and sent to them. The message read: "Sister I am in grave trouble please can somebody come the villain has left me." The dead Cleva is a figure of family melodrama as well as an unwitting footnote to the stage history of the early twentieth century. She is also the double of Gissing's Monica Madden, who dies giving birth to a daughter after her flirtation with a "rogue," just as Edith, who initially takes Cleva's daughter and still later raises Jane, is an analogous figure to Alice Madden.

After Jane leaves Gabriel in Manhattan, she decides to enter the plot of the Cleva drama more directly. She finds the villain, Von Voorst, alive and well in New York and visits him with the intention of confronting him with his past. But instead of finding a repentant and decrepit demon-lover, she encounters a gentle, intelligent, and lively old gentleman with whom she discusses Aristotelian theory. Convinced that the man who played the villain could never have been the man to seduce and abandon her Aunt Cleva, Jane confronts the ambiguity of all texts in her effort to deconstruct the family myth. Did Cleva's "the villain," scrawled beside the name of the hero in the margin of the playbill, indicate that she ran away with the hero of the play who in life turned out to be a villain? For Jane, Cleva's narrative now appears unresolved, open-ended, like Kitty's past and her own future. Kitty flushed away the secrets of her diary, while Von Voorst unwittingly confuses the neat didacticism Jane's family has constructed around the Cleva melodrama.

There is nothing ambiguous or unresolved, however, about the article "One Hundred and One Ways He Uses You Every Day," one of the last tales-within-a-tale in *The Odd Woman*. This collectively written piece for a feminist press is Godwin's satiric jab at the foolish excesses of women's anger and at the clichéd lack of complexity she perceives in militant feminist texts. Jane's old college friend Gerda, who has spent her life following the fashions of the day, has channeled her feminist rage, as has Rhoda Nunn of Gissing's novel, into a cause - the newspaper *Feme Sole*. The title of the publication, of course, is yet another play on *The Odd Women*. Gerda not only represents women's anger and autonomy but also turns this theme into a cause for celebration and a shrewd business venture. The prescriptiveness of the piece in Gerda's paper is so similar to the determined lives of nineteenth-century heroines that Jane is enraged. When she is recruited to stay up all night thinking of twenty-six more ways that women are victimized by men, she rebels. This, she

realizes, is nothing more than a collective effort to write yet another resolved and grim narrative about the victimization of females.

However, as part of her continual dialogue with Sonia Marks about the miserable role of women in romantic fiction, Jane has begun to compile a list of women whose bodies fill the graveyards of the nineteenth-century novel. Naming this literary convention the "Emma Bovary Syndrome," Jane scribbles down the names of numerous female protagonists who are punished for aberrant sexual behavior - Lily Bart, Anna Karenina, and Hetty Sorrel among them. Before she finishes her list, and immediately prior to leaving Gabriel, Jane runs out of space in the margins. Unlike Gerda's prescribed number of offenses committed by men, the number of women who have been written out of literary life, Jane knows, is open-ended. She refuses to inscribe a story about another pathetic female victim or to become one herself.

Unlike the texts of Gissing or Gerda, *The Odd Woman* is circular, open-ended, and hopeful. At the conclusion of the novel, Jane is at home, in bed, actively confronting her sleeplessness, the student papers, the stories within stories which she tells herself and which have been narrated for her by canonized authors, popular culture, friends, and family members. Throughout the novel she has deconstructed, revised, or abandoned some of the plots that have both enticed and paralyzed her in the past - perpetual romantic gratification, for instance, or the melodramatic death of a young woman, as well as her own visionary but finally unsatisfying story with the Pre-Raphaelite scholar Gabriel. Unlike the fates of Gissing's five odd women, Jane's is still being written.

Jane herself imagines the final, bed-time tale with which *The Odd Woman* concludes. This story is a fantasy that revises the evening news and parodies Jane's own obsession in the novel with her body and its functions. Throughout the novel, she has surveyed her body in mirror after mirror, finding herself in clothes that seem always unsuitable, confining, and unstylish. Or she eats, drinks, purges, always anxious to prevent the nasty sounds of defecation or flatulence from reaching her lover's ears.[8] At the conclusion of the novel, as Jane imagines the "Enema Bandit" at her bedside, an actual criminal she has heard about on the evening news who forces enemas on his female victims, she weaves a fantasy that fuses her body, and identity, with his:

> Go in my closet and dress yourself in my warmest clothes; take my purse

[8] Rachel Brownstein has commented that "the sense of the body as a fragile, vulnerable container of a self or selves problematically female is what *The Odd Woman* most convincingly portrays. Godwin is good on the body loathsome in dressing rooms and at odds with its digestive tract. Her concern with the containing body neatly parallels Jane's preoccupation with literary role models and also parodies it (*American Women Writing Fiction* 183).

> . . . . If anyone stops you . . . tell him you're Jane Clifford, a professor in the English Department. . . . Then walk fast to the bus station and take the first bus out and don't get off till you've reached the place where the snow melts away and you think you can turn your oddities inside out like a sock and find your own best life by making them work for you instead of being driven by them. (419)

In this final story, Jane imaginatively, if comically, transcends the divisions - between male and female, victim and victimizer, art and life, the academic and quotidian worlds, oddity and normalcy, the containing body and its contents - that have dominated this novel and the texts it revises. In becoming the Enema Bandit, Jane is transformed into an androgynous bandit-professor who turns things - identities, professions, fiction, victimization - inside out.

Immediately prior to this fantasy, Jane has imagined teaching *The Odd Women* to Portia Prentiss, an underprivileged black woman who has struggled through Jane's previous course in Romanticism. In that cross-racial pedagogical situation, the reader might imagine yet another subversion of Gissing's fatalism, a social turning of things inside out. With her revisionary intertextuality - and this paper has touched on only some of it - Godwin has turned the destructive hegemonic plots inside out for her readers. Jane has done this for herself with her Enemy-Bandit metaphor. This liberating inversion is the metaphor for which Jane, like many women and many teachers, has been searching.

VIRGINIA SMITH

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH
PENN STATE UNIVERSITY
UNIVERSITY PARK